Despatched August 18th 1859.

Library of Congress.
Chap. BR746
Shelf .C57
Copyright No.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

LECTURES

ON THE

EARLY HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN ENGLAND.

WITH

Sermons

DELIVERED ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS.

BY

THOMAS WINTHROP COIT, D.D., LL.D.,
RECTOR OF ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, TROY, N. Y.

"Ego tamen Deo nostro gratias ago, quod in his libris non qualis essem, cu multa desunt, sed qualis esse debeat, qui in doctrinâ sanâ, id est, Christianâ, non solum sibi, sed etiam aliis laborare studet, quantulacunque potuit facultate."—*St. Augustine de Doct. Christ.*

NEW YORK:
DANIEL DANA, JR., 381 BROADWAY.
TROY, N. Y.:—W. H. YOUNG,
1859.

BR 746
.C57

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1859,
By Thomas W. Coit,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York.

NEW YORK :
BILLIN AND BROTHER, PRINTERS,
XX, NORTH WILLIAM ST.

12 S45

S.G.B.5 Feb 46

TO THE

Parishioners of St. Paul's Church, Troy, N. Y.

BEFORE WHOM

THESE LECTURES AND SERMONS WERE DELIVERED;

AND FROM WHOM

THE AUTHOR HAS RECEIVED MUCH KINDNESS,

They are now Dedicated,

WITH SINCERE SENTIMENTS

OF

RESPECT AND AFFECTION.

NOTICE.

These Lectures and Sermons have not sought publicity. Their author has often been asked to print these, or similar productions, and has often declined to do so; waiting (if God should grant it) for a period of leisure, to enable him to review the labors of years gone by. Last Christmas Day, however, a subscription list was handed him, the object of which was to defray the expense of a printed volume, and to make of that volume a present to himself, suited to a festive religious season. Such a gift, under such circumstances, he could not well refuse, and the result has been the following book. The Lectures on the Early History of Christianity in England are unfinished; but, as they were particularly asked for, all which had been written were given to the press. The notes are designed, of course, for those only who wish to examine the subject somewhat more critically. Any reader who finds them cumbersome can easily pass them by, and confine himself to the text alone.

Rectory, St. Paul's Church, Troy,
April 5, 1859.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

Christianity in Britain derived from the East, and not from Rome.—As old in Britain as it is in Italy..... 1

LECTURE II.

Sketch of the Christian History of Britain, to the Invasion of the Pagan Saxons, and the Retreat of the Christian Britons into Wales and Cornwall..... 35

LECTURE III.

The Italian Mission of Gregory the First to East England, at the close of the Sixth Century.—Its Motives and earlier Fortunes..... 65

LECTURE IV.

Bearing of the new Religion from Rome towards the old Christianity, which it encountered in the British Isles..... 101

LECTURE V.

Means by which Romanism intruded and fastened itself upon the British Isles.—Proof that it was not the principal Means of converting the Pagans there, and was not at all necessary for converting them..... 136

SERMON I.

THE QUESTIONER OF FUNDAMENTAL VERITIES.

"And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die. For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."—*Genesis*, iii. 4, 5..... 177

SERMON II.

THE BURNING BUSH: ITS MEANING AND APPLICATIONS.

"And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him, out of the midst of a bush; and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed."—*Exodus*, iii. 2. 193

SERMON III.

HISTORY OF THE SOUL: ITS ORIGIN, NATURE, AND DESTINY.

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."—*Genesis*, ii. 7..... 213

SERMON IV.

PROVIDENCES OF GOD IN THE HISTORY OF NAAMAN.

"Now, Naaman, captain of the host of the King of Syria, was a great man with his master, and honorable, because by him the Lord had given deliverance unto Syria: he was also a mighty man in valor, but he was a leper."—2 *Kings*, v. 1.. 232

SERMON V.

GOD'S USES OF EVIL BEINGS.

FROM THE PSALTER.

"Slay them not, lest my people forget it; but scatter them abroad among the people, and put them down, O Lord, our defence."—*Psalm* lix. 11..... 247

SERMON VI.

THE RAINBOW.

"And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations: I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud: and I will remember my covenant which is between me and you, and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth."—*Genesis*, ix. 12–17 264

SERMON VII.

SUBMISSION OF THE WILL, A PREREQUISITE FOR KNOWLEDGE.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

"If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself."—*John*, vii. 17 280

SERMON VIII.

THE REPENTANCE OF THE WOMAN WHICH WAS A SINNER.

FOR SEXAGESIMA SUNDAY.

"And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, and stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment."—*Luke*, vii. 37, 38 297

SERMON IX.

THE STANDARD OF APPEAL ON DOUBTFUL POINTS, WHERE THE BIBLE FAILS TO PRODUCE UNITY.

"For the Jews had agreed already, that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the Synagogue."—*John*, ix. 22. "Behold, I thought, he will surely come out to me."—2 *Kings*, v. 11. "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth."—*Acts*, xxvi. 9. "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"—*Acts*, ix. 6..... 311

EARLY HISTORY

OF

CHRISTIANITY IN ENGLAND.

EARLY HISTORY

OF

CHRISTIANITY IN ENGLAND.

LECTURE I.

CHRISTIANITY IN BRITAIN DERIVED FROM THE EAST, AND NOT FROM ROME.—AS OLD IN BRITAIN AS IT IS IN ITALY.

THE question is often asked me, 'Which is the oldest portion of the Christian Church?' And the question is put with an especial view towards the hypothesis, that the Church of Rome was the oldest Church of Great Britain, and indeed the only Church which the Kingdom of Great Britain ever knew, until the period of the *Protestant* Reformation. I say *Protestant* Reformation; because it would be easy to show, that Rome had the word reformation on her own tongue, and for her own sake, in many a day long gone; though she now uses it with a sneer, in reference to ourselves.[a]

a In Gallemart's Council of Trent "Reformation" is about the most frequent running title; and in the "Reformed Edition" also. Richerius says, that the excesses of Gregory VII. compelled his Church to enter on the business of Reformation, in the Councils of Constance and Basle. —*Historia Concil. Gen. Coloniæ*, 1680, vol. i. 402. Richerius receives high praise from Bossuet, in his Defensio Cleri Gallicani, vol. i. p. 519, etc. Brown, in his Fasciculus, gives us the titles of some 250 books, or authors, in favor of a reformation of the Church of Rome, *before* the era

The question referred to ought not to be asked by people, who know from their New Testament, that Christianity was founded, not at Rome, but far away from Rome, in the metropolis of the Holy Land; and that, at the great Pentecost celebrated after our Lord's Ascension, there was not a convert from the City of Rome, known in the history of Christianity. There were Romans at that Pentecost, beyond a doubt, since the second chapter of the Acts informs us of the fact.[b] Yet these Romans were not Christians, but Jews, or proselytes to the Jewish faith, who had come to Jerusalem to celebrate one of the grand festivals of Judaism, and moreover, *as such*, were strangers, i. e., quite unknown to their brethren in the familiar, central home of their people and their religion. Some of these strangers may have carried Christianity back with them to Italy;[c] and their faith, more than a quarter of a century after, did become somewhat famous, as we learn from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.[d] Nevertheless, even then must Christianity

of the Protestant Reformation.—*Brown's Fasciculus*, ii. pp. 794–97. Brown's work is a folio.

To crown this matter, let us hear what the President of the Council of Trent said, in his opening speech: "The depravation and corruption of discipline and manners in the Church of Rome, was in a great measure the cause and original of all those schisms and heresies, which then troubled the Church."—*Orat. præf. sessio* 11, *Labbè Concil.* vol. xiv. col. 800. Paris, 1672. Compare *Hussey's Academical Sermons*, p. 130. Oxford, 1849. Reformation, according to Bossuet, ought to have begun very far back; for he speaks of the Council of Constance's *potior auctoritas in reformatione generali promovenda*.—Defensio Cleri Gallicani, vol. ii. p. 85.

b Acts, ii. 10.

c Burton's Lect. Ecc. Hist. i. 230.

d Romans, i. 8.

have been quite in its infancy at Rome; since we find St. Paul, on his first arrival there (A. D. 63),[e] speaking to his Jewish, rather than to his Christian brethren; while we find them replying in terms, which clearly indicate, that a personage not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles was an individual, whose advent to the Eternal City had created no stir, though he came with an appeal to Cæsar on his lips.[f] St. Paul found himself ignored by his Jewish brethren, whom he had left behind him—utterly ignored, as one likely to make a movement in behalf of Christianity, on the most important of all earthly theatres, where it could rouse and draw attention.

Christianity then, in Rome, at St. Paul's first visit to a spot afterwards claiming unrivalled precedence in Christian history—some thirty years after our Lord's Ascension, and when the religion had spread very extensively in the East—was known *there*, only as a sect, and not (as we should now say) as a see—known too but as an almost universally derided and depreciated sect,[g] which probably had no recognized tangible head, and no ostensible Church, except such an one as we read of in the house of Aquila and Priscilla—the Church of a domestic oratory. In Jerusalem (on the contrary) there *was* such a recognized tangible head, with its surrounding cabinet of assessors; we discover it in Acts, xxi. 18, when St. Paul made his missionary report before James Bishop of

e In the spring of A. D. 62, according to Dr. Hales, Chronology, iii. 545, 2d ed.

f Acts, xxviii. 21.

g Acts, xxviii. 22.

Jerusalem, with his elders *all* about him. The Epistle of this Bishop was placed in the canon of the New Testament, *before* the Epistles of St. Peter, because of his position at the head of the oldest Church of Christendom.[h] In Jerusalem—a dozen years before Christianity had a Church out of a private residence in Rome—there was an ecumenical council of the Church Catholic, as we are informed in the 15th chapter of the Acts.[i] This council issued not mere

h The authority for this is the venerable Bede, in his preface to St. James's Epistle. And that preface, accordingly, has often been left out by the Romanists; because it reflects, in their view, upon "the royalties of St. Peter!"—See *Giles Bede*, vol. xii. pp. xii. and 157. Also *Cave's Historia Literaria*, edit. 1740. i. 614.—This is but one instance, among a thousand, of the manner in which Romanists hack and garble "ancient authors," to make them suit *their* purposes. Luther, Zuingle, and the Continental Reformers, have too often been blamed by Episcopalians, for declining a trial by the Fathers. They did so, because Rome had so garbled the Fathers, that the trial would have been unfair, and would, of course, have gone against them. This is admitted by such divines as Field and Reeves.—*Field on the Church*, new edit. ii. 407, note; *Reeves's Apologies*, 2d edit. ii. 356, note. Chemnitz, the profound examiner of the Council of Trent, has nearly fifty closely printed octavo pages on Traditions; divides them into eight distinct species; admits, that not the *text* only of the Scriptures was entrusted to the Church Catholic, but also its *true interpretation;* and finally, talks like any intelligent churchman, about the value of the Catholic consent of the Fathers; esteeming it in the same way in which any sensible lawyer would esteem a clear tissue of precedents. Cranmer did not appeal to the Bible alone, in disparagement of primitive antiquity; but of "schoolmen and Popish canons."—*Strype's Cranmer*, new edit. p. 62. The assent of French Protestants to Tradition, properly understood, is quoted by Bingham. Antiquities, vol. ix. p. 65. Continental Protestants have always had doctrinal sympathy with the Church of England. Bishop Andrews spoke of them most kindly; Archbishop Laud corresponded, on affectionate terms, with the Calvinists at Zurich; and Mr. Palmer, in his elaborate treatise on the Church, refuses to call Continental Protestants either heretics, or schismatics.—Palmer on the Church, pt 1. ch. 12, § 4.

i Gerson admits, as does Prof. Hug, that James, and not Peter, was the president of this Council.—Gersoni, Opera ii, cols. 1, 12. Compare

hortatory advice, but "decrees for to keep,"[j] in the name of the whole authority of Christendom, under the sanction of the Holy Ghost—decrees especially addressed to "the brethren which are of the Gentiles, in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia;" but which would have been sent also to Rome, with the plenitude of apostolic power, to be obeyed by Romans, if Christianity had then had in Rome a local habitation and a name.[k]

Why, my brethren, if I may add one more circumstance to this series of circumstances, to show that Christianity began in the East, and was circulated in the East, long before a Roman of Italy knew so much as its bare existence,[l] I may call your attention to the fact, that our Religion got its very name in the East, and not in the West. The disciples of Jesus first received their present distinctive appellation at Antioch in Syria: they had previously been nicknamed Nazarenes.[m] The very word "Christian," then, is one

column 924. Antwerp, 1706.—Richerius says, that James was the judicial officer of the Council; Spanheim, that he was its president and organ. No doubt, had Peter but acted the part of James, we should never have heard the last of it.

j Acts, xvi. 4. Δόγματα. Nebuchadnezzar's decree of death, in Dan. ii. 13, is called by the LXX. Δόγμα.

k The second General Council, called Jerusalem's Church, "the Mother of all the Churches:" and this in an epistle to the Bishop of Rome in Council!—Theodoret (Bagster's ed.) p. 292, bk v. ch. 9;—Crakanthorpe's Defensio, new ed. pp. 23, 24;—Perceval on the Roman Schism, pp. 32, 69. Jerusalem called by the Fathers, "The Lord's own Throne."—Forbes's Historic Theology, lib. xv. ch. 4, § 5.—Comp. Eusebius's Life of Constantine. Bagster. pp. 334–5.

l Not only are Jerusalem and Antioch older in Christianity than Rome, but Edessa too. Indeed, Edessa is said to have been the first city in the world which openly professed Christianity, and built the first church-edifice. Edessa, or Osrohœna, is situated in the north of Mesopotamia, hard by the Euphrates.—*Etheridge's Syrian Churches.* London, 1846. p. 37.

m Acts, xi. 26; xxiv. 5.—In olden and more honest times, it was not

with whose origin Rome has had nothing to do; and I might add just as much and more (if time permitted) to show that it has had as little to do with the origin of a word it now glories in as exclusively its own, the word *Catholic*.[n] Catholic is a Greek word,

such a novelty, as it would now be, to find a Romish divine acknowledging that the Greek Church was older than his own. Thus Nicholas De Clemangis (A. D. 1417) could do it frankly.—*Opera edit. Lydius*, Tractatus, p. 92. Nor so only: Clemangis acknowledged that Rome had degenerated.—"Cujus ultima non correspondent primis."—*Ibid.*

n Any scholar, who has a Greek Concordance, knows that this word is not to be found in the New Testament. But it may be important to *some* to know that such a thorough devotee of the Roman Church as Delahogue admits the fact.—*Tractatus de Ecclesiâ*, p. 62. Another divine of the same Church, Bernard Marechal, in his concordance of the Early Fathers, gives Ignatius's Epistle to the Smyrneans, as the first authority for its use; which I believe to be correct.—*Concordantia*, tom. i. p. 24. Eusebius, in his Church History, represents the Church in Smyrna as using the word, (after the example perhaps of Ignatius,) in giving an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp; who is called in that Epistle, "bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna"—and who, possibly, is the first Christian ecclesiastic, who ever had *Catholic* attached to his name.—Eusebius's Hist. bk iv. ch. 15. At any rate, it is clear that the word *Catholic* is of Greek, and not of Latin origin; and the Latin Church has no peculiar title to it, and least of all an exclusive one. Her proper title is the Roman Church: as this is the *first* title which her own creed (Pope Pius's) gives her; and is the only title given her in that most stringent of instruments, a Romish bishop's oath of allegiance to the Pope. No member of that Church, accordingly, can complain of this title; and Protestants of all sorts are most unwise and careless, to voluntarily degrade themselves, and call a Romanist a Catholic, when he, in turn, will give them only the worst and most abusive of all ecclesiastical appellations—that of heretic! If, however, a member of the Church of Rome complains that he is not called a Catholic the matter can easily be settled by saying, He may be called so, if he will return the title! See what answer such a proposal will bring.

To prejudiced Protestants, who ignorantly eschew the word *Catholic* as dangerous, it may be enough to say, it is ridiculous (not to use a more solemn word—blasphemous) to say, in Church, in *God's* presence, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," and to repudiate or dishonor the word, in *man's* presence!

Any one who wishes to pursue, further, the history of the word *Catholic* among the records of antiquity, will find ample matter in Suicer's

and not a Latin one, and was developed not among the Christians of the West, but among the Christians of the East. The East, too, has always had more regard to genuine Catholicity, than (to say the least) Italian Christianity; and has laid down rules both as to creeds and discipline, which, if faithfully adhered to, would have rescued us from the thraldom of Popery forevermore.[o]

Thesaurus, under Καθολικός; and in the first Epistle of Pacian, which may be found in vol. 17 of the Library of the Fathers, p. 319. The use of the word became controverted in Pacian's time, (say A. D. 350, or about the middle of the fourth century,) and he wrote in its defence. His *formal* advocacy of the word is the first I am acquainted with. Pacian admits that the word was not used in the days of the Apostles; but defends it, strenuously, on the ground recognized in the sixth canon of the Council of Nice, *i. e.* old custom. In other words, on the ground of respectable precedent; the one constantly recognized in our courts of law.

If, however, any one thinks it strange that "a fuss" should be made about the word *Catholic*, at the present day, let him know, that our ancestors, in the great battle fought with Romanism in the latter part of the seventeenth century, deemed it worth while to be particular, and to complain, not that the word itself was a bad one, but misappropriated, because self-appropriated, by the Church of Rome. Bishop Lloyd explained the matter, and contended for the exclusive, oriental pedigree of the word, in a sermon preached before the King of England, in 1678. See *Gibson's Preservative*, octavo edition, vol. xii. p. 3, etc. Bp. Lloyd brings up one very important fact, that the *ancient* Unitarians, like the *modern* Romanists, called themselves exclusively "the Catholics."

To crown the whole matter, it is now evident, that the simple word *Catholic* is becoming insufficient, in the view of Romanists themselves. In Spain, they have enlarged the Apostles' Creed, putting the epithet *Holy* before the *Virgin*, and *Roman* before Church!—*Meyrick's Working of the Church in Spain.* London. 1851. p. 172.—*McCoan's Protestant Endurance.* London. 1853. pp. 170, 171. Development must go on. A Quaternity in Unity has already been hinted at.—*Hales's Ch. of the British Isles*, p. 185, note. The Spaniards have enlarged the Apostles' Creed for the Virgin; the present Pope has made her sinless; the next Pope may give her a place among the persons of the Godhead, and then the Quaternity in Unity will be substantiated!

o Canons 7 and 8 of the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431. Hammond on the Council, Eng. edit. pp. 69, 70.—So Bp. Jewel, Works, iv. 883; and

The East then it is, and not the West, which has founded our religion—given it its most venerable and abiding names of Christian, and of Catholic—inaugurated its commencement—disseminated its principles—spread far and wide its blessings. Nay, and I may add, the East it is, which accomplished all this in its own peculiar way, and under its own peculiar sanctions.[p] The first Christian Church which was founded in Rome itself, was a Greek Church, and not a Latin Church; and a more palpable and irresistible evidence of this fact, you could not possess, than the circumstance that when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, he wrote in the Greek tongue, and not in the Roman.[q] We should have expected him to write to Corinthians, and to Ephesians in Greek, and in the same tongue, perhaps, to Colossians and Galatians.[r] But to write to people in Rome in the Greek tongue—himself a

charged Rome with falling away from the Greeks. Apology, pt v. ch. 15, div. 2. Wks. iii. 92. Parker, Soc. Edition.

p So Christianity in Africa not from Rome.—Jewel, iv. 883.

q Some interpreters of Scripture have contended that Paul wrote in Latin. But a candid member of the Roman or Latin Church admits, that almost all critics allow that he wrote directly in the Greek tongue. —*Janssen's Hermeneutique Sacrée*, p. 215. Paris, 1855.

r "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek," (Rom. x. 12,) does not *prove* that St. Paul considered himself writing to Jews and Greeks only; but it certainly looks that way. Then sometimes he has said *Jew* and *Greek*, in the original, when our translators make him say Jew and *Gentile*. For example, Rom. ii. 9, 10; iii. 9. Dean Milman, I am informed, considers the first Christian Church in Rome a Greek one. But I have not, at present, access to his new history of the Latin Church. St. Jerome says, that no ecclesiastical author wrote in Latin, till Victor did so. Pope from A. D. 192 to 202.—*Art de verifier les dates*. Paris, 1770, p. 241. *Bower's Popes*, i. 39. There were but three Latin Fathers of distinction for 300 years; Tertullian, Minutius Felix, and Cyprian. All three Africans! In the same period, there were ten or more Greek Fathers!

Roman citizen, and for the age a universal scholar—for *him* to do so, demonstrates that he was dealing with Greek Christians, more than with Latin Christians; and that Christianity, even in Rome, was an exotic, and not an indigenous production. The long list of salutations with which the Epistle to the Romans closes—the personal familiarity which St. Paul seems to have had with many or most of the Roman Church, though he wrote to them, when as yet he had never set foot upon Italian soil[s]— demonstrates that Christianity had not sprung up in Rome, out of the inhabitants of Rome, but had been imported thither *by*, and retained *among* comparative strangers. All which goes to show, that in the City of Rome itself, Christianity was indebted for its foundation to Orientals, rather than Occidentals—was an Eastern, and not a Western religion—and, therefore, that Rome has as much to thank the East for, as that very Syria, where first Christianity was known as a distinctive name.

How idle, how absurd, in view of such testimony, to think and speak of Christianity as if Rome were its first habitation—its birth-place, and self-extending home—as if from Rome came the Church, the ministry, the sacraments, the faith, the genealogy, the descent, the perpetuation, and all the consequent glories of Christianity as a system:—and as if the Church of Rome had ever been in fact, what it now fancies itself to be, and what it now most presumptuously claims

s Romans, i. 13; xv. 22, show that St. Paul had never visited Rome at the time he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. Dr. Burton thinks that, at that time, no apostle had visited Rome.—*Lectures on Ecc. Hist.*, i., 230.

to be, the Church Catholic inclusively, and to the exclusion of all christendom beside.[t] Why nothing is clearer than this, that although Rome, at the foundation of Christianity, was the capital of the greatest empire of the age, yet, that in an ecclesiastical sense, you might have applied to it such language as St. Luke applied to Philippi, when Christianity was introduced there, and he described it as the chief city of that part of Macedonia where it was situated, and a colony.[u] Rome was then (ecclesiastically speaking) but the chief city of that part of Italy where it was situated, and a Christian colony. Nor for centuries could it be styled much more than is included in the first part of this description. Down to the era, for instance, of the great Nicene Council, usually called the first of the councils ecumenical, or general, i. e., down to A. D. 325, Rome had no more predominance assigned to it, than such, and just such a local and geographical distinction as was assigned to the chief city of Egypt, viz.: Alexandria; and to the chief city of Syria, viz.: Antioch. And even *this* predominance was conceded by the supreme ecclesiastical legislature, not at all as a matter of Divine warrant, but simply as one of convenience and propriety, which had grown up *by custom.*[v] Alexandria and Antioch and Rome were each,

t "Whoever," said Pope Leo I., "doth affect more than his due, doth lose that which properly belonged to him."—Quoted by *Barrow on the Supremacy. Works.* Hughes's edit., vol. vii., p. 437. By setting up this undue claim, Rome becomes not *catholic*, but *anti-catholic.* The title *anti-catholic* is as pertinent as any which can be given her. Rome, *Leone judice*, has ceased to be *catholic.*

u Acts, xvi. 12.

v Sixth canon of Nice.—Du Pin's Ch. Hist., Dublin edit., i. 600; with

by the sense of courtesy and expediency entertained by the Council, to enjoy a similar control over the Churches in their immediate vicinity; and no greater popedom than this (the patriarchal superintendance of central cities) has the Church Catholic, the true Church Catholic, ever created, or sanctioned, or transmitted. Yet out of such a germ (for error like truth always has a nucleus, and sometimes a nucleus which is real and substantial—and some of the worst errors the Church has ever been cursed with are errors of overgrowth and superaddition,) out of such a germ, has grown the enormities of the patriarchate of Italy, until it has resembled the little horn of the prophet's vision,[w] and waxed exceeding great, towards the south, and the east, and the pleasantest of lands—till it has waxed great, even to the host of heaven, and has cast down some of the host, and of the stars, to the ground, and stamped upon them with the heel of despotic scorn. This power, in its overgrowth, its superadditions, has arrogated as much as Satan in the tempta-

a full discussion of it in his Dissertations on Ancient Discipline. Printed at Mayence or Mentz, on the Rhine, 1787; p. 65, etc.—Palmer on the Church, part vii., chap. vii., shows the bearing of the canon on the Roman Patriarchate. This canon, of course, has been subjected to Romish garbling. Yet Abp. Caranza and John Cabassutius, while they would fain alter it, do not do so; and Renaudot, with commendable honesty, rebukes a fellow-Romanist for fibbing about it.—*Caranza Summa Conciliorum.* Lovanii, 1681. pp. 37, 38.—*Cabassutii Notitiæ Conciliorum.* 1670. pp. 89, 90.—*Renaudotii Liturg. Collectio,* 2d edition, 1847, ii. 95. "It were easy, by many other examples, to declare that the Popes have made this a very trade and custom, as if it were a piece of Pope-craft, either themselves to forge, or, which is every way as bad, to abet, countenance, and maintain by their authority, such writings as were forged by others; and, by them, to build up their own pomp and pontifical glory."—*Crackenthorp's Defence of Constantine.* London, 1621. p. 242.

w Dan. viii. 9.

tion of Christ[x]—has claimed the entire globe as its spiritual domain. And in particular has it both claimed, and insisted, that Great Britain was its domain, twice or even three times over—first, by its general viceregency over the globe—secondly, by its introduction of Christianity upon British soil, when Christianity was utterly unknown there—and thirdly, by its redemption of Britain from Paganism, when it had relapsed and become idolatrous.

A higher claim than this—better ribbed and banded with extra strength—it is probable could not well be found, or be manufactured to order, if given out to human witlings for the trial of their ingenuity. If there is truth in it, then Britain belongs to Rome, in a sense comporting somewhat with the extravagance of Rome's pretensions; and the British Reformation, with the abnegation of Papal jurisdiction, was a presumptuous error. This, of course, is the issue we are now to try; and thereby to ascertain (as I think can be done without great difficulty) how much Britain owes Rome, on the score of ecclesiastical allegiance. The issue depends on the answer to three questions—What does Britain owe to Rome, on account of her claim to universal dominion? What on account of the pretension, that Christianity came first to her shores, through Roman instrumentality?[y] What on account

x Luke, iv. 6.

y This agreement has been more talked of, than written about, according to Fullwood.—*Roma Ruit,* new edit. 1847, p. 29. Cardinal Wiseman revived it in the Dublin Review; and received an overwhelming answer from Mr. Palmer, in his "British Episcopacy Vindicated," a 12mo. vol. of 253 pages, printed by the Rivingtons in London, in 1840.

of the allegation, that when Christianity in Britain had, in the progress of dark centuries, subsided into Paganism, Rome renewed and perpetuated its existence, so that, to her interference, the permanence of Christianity on English soil is altogether indebted?

I.—As to the first of these questions, it relates simply to the old presumption of Rome, in which England is no more concerned than all the rest of Christendom; and we may safely say to it, that England will admit it, when Rome's old peers in the primitive patriarchate admit it also.[z]

Christendom in primitive times, was divided into five principalities or patriarchates, taking their names from the cities of Rome, of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Antioch, and of Jerusalem. Among these, Rome had no primacy, but that of dignity; no precedence, but that of numerical order; no headship, but that of courtesy;[a] and since there must always be some way of distinguishing equals, when they

z Optimus interpres rerum usus.—*Broom's Legal Maxims*, 2d edit. p. 712. This is the lawyer's rule, and a sound one, about contested titles and claims, which date far back. We must then be determined by usage, by precedent, by the evidence especially of contemporaries. This is plain enough; and the simple question is, Did Rome's contemporaries allow her assumptions? Have these assumptions come down undisputed? Only *this* need be added, for a reminder, when Rome gets excited, and pronounces most dogmatically in her own behalf. I allude to Aristotle's maxim, "Every man is a bad judge in his own case."

a Like one ambassador's eminence over another.—*Birkbeck's Protestants' Evidence*, 2d edit. p. 208. Birkbeck was an author relied on by John Selden and Robert Southey, most competent judges. In respect to the powers or control of patriarchates, it is a curious fact, that *as a patriarch* the bishop of Alexandria had a more complete authority than any of his colleagues.—*Beaven's Irenæus*, pp. 19, 20. Hook, in his Church Dictionary, says the Patriarch of Alexandria calls himself, "The Grand Judge of the whole world."—*Dict.*, 6th edit. p. 465.

meet on the same platform, it was no harm to give Rome, the chief city of the greatest empire on the globe—the empire's oldest capital—a presiding superiority: no greater harm, than to give our oldest bishop such a superiority among his brethren, when they meet and act officially. The heads of these five patriarchates (they were called *heads*, because the first letters of their sees composed a Greek word signifying *heads*)[b] were the five presiding bishops of ancient Christendom; and when they met in council, the patriarch of Rome was the presiding prelate among his peers, and nothing more.[c] As such, no doubt, he attracted an immense amount of reverence and homage, which was finally, by skilful management, converted into submission to claims of arrogant authority. This arrogant authority was bolstered, and confirmed, by political grants and financial revenue, until it became a fixture—was nursed into a government, and extended into a dominion. And the fruit is all before us in history, and in our own passing times. The patriarchate of Rome has become a dukedom, a monarchy, a popedom. The most dignified ecclesiastic of antiquity has become the Church's Em-

b KAPAI. To call the Patriarchs κάραι was harmless enough; but to say there must be five patriarchs, because man has five senses, is a specimen of mediæval reasoning in theology.—*Suicer's Thesaurus*, 2d edit. ii. 643.

c *Field on the Church*, new edit. i. 113.—*Thorndike de Ratione Finiendi Controversias*, p. 412. The Greeks looked carefully after *the faith*. Loss of faith was, with them, loss of place. They acknowledged the Pope's patriarchate, *if he were orthodox*. *Field*, ibid. And doubtless this is right; orthodoxy goes before orders. See the bishop's oath in the Consecration Service for Bishops. It puts ecclesiastical matters thus, (1) doctrine, (2) discipline, (3) worship.

peror. The little horn of by-gone ages, whose cathedral was a chamber in the domicil of Aquila and Priscilla—whose palace the cottage of Simon the tanner—has magnified itself into the princedom of the Christian host; and its pretended charter now is (with the whole globe as a field to work in) "to root out, and to throw down, to destroy, and to pull down, to build, and to plant."[d]

But if this was wrong from its inception, it can not have become right by the lapse of time, and persistive usage. The rule of law, and of common sense, is, that prescription does not run against a party who is unable to act;[e] yet the assumptions of Rome have been forced upon millions, who were not among the living when those assumptions were born. A usurper is none the less a usurper because he has established a permanent sovereignty.[f] If Cromwell had become (what he sorely wanted to be in title, and more than which he was in strict reality) a king, and if his descendants, with his unquestionable talent for government, still sat upon England's throne, would they—

d Jerem. i. 10. Comp. Dan. v. 19. Compare Gregory's Dictates. *Giesler's Ch. Hist.*, Eng. edit. iii. 5, 6. *Murdock's Mosheim*, ii. 188, 189. *Richerius' Hist. Concil. Gen.* i. 396. *Du Pin's Epitome Ch. Hist.* iii. 108, or 116. *Prof. Richardson's Prælectiones*, ii. 217.

e Broom's Legal Maxims, 2d edit. p. 700.

f "The Popes," says Fleury, "acquired a right, by being asked for favors when there was no occasion; and to render themselves necessary, they set up pretended titles."—*Fleury's Ecc. Hist.* vol. xvi. p. xviii., or, pp. 258, 259 of his translated Discourses. Bossuet, *after* showing how, once, the Popes swore to obey the canons, *then* shows how they behaved, when they departed from the good old rule—"ab ea regulâ." He solemnly declares, that by degrees, "*paullatim*," they began to draw to themselves the rights of bishops, and all other clergy.—*Defensio Cleri Gallicani*, lib. xi. chaps. 8 and 9.

at this late day—be any more the constitutional sovereigns of England, than in the middle of the 17th century? Assuredly not. And so, if the Bishop of Rome was not at the first, and under Divine sanction, what he at present insists on being accounted, his present claims are as illegitimate, and impertinent, and repudiable, as when, not far from A. D. 200, he began to play the part of a grandee among his brethren, and threatened to break from their communion, if they would not observe his behests about the observance of Easter[g]—or rather, about the mere day for the observance of that universally acknowledged festival. His menaces flew by the prelates of the East, as if but idle wind; and the menaces of a successor, though about a more serious matter, passed as unheeded by the prelates of the South in Africa.[h] The prelates of the East, the prelates of Greece and of Turkey in Europe, the prelates of Russia, still refuse submission to him. The heads of the old quintuple patriarchate still refuse submission to him—four out of the five having always been determinedly against him—leaving him always, in his unitarian minority of a single one, and still leaving him there; having actually, since the present pope came into power, as earnestly and solemnly protested against

g Robertson's Church History, i. pp. 68, 69. Bower's Popes, i. 37, etc. *Eusebius*, book v. 24. *Mosheim's Commentaries by Murdock*, i. 535, etc.

h Robertson's Ch. Hist., i. 438, 39. *Allies on Schism*, 2d ed. pp. 130, etc. *Morton's Catholike Appeal*, bk i. ch. 2, § 28, or, p. 31. Meyrick's sensible little book on the Papal Supremacy. Prof. Hussey's *thorough* lectures.

his usurpations, as their predecessors have done, strait through a thousand years.[i]

And how then can it be esteemed a very strange thing, that the prelates of England should be found in their company, and amid such an outspread congregation? Or why should they be distinctively called Protestant; when perhaps half of Christendom (some think more than half)[j] is still in the same protestant attitude with themselves, towards the assumptions of Rome's patriarch; and if it regards him, as all now might consent to regard him, i. e., as the most dignified ecclesiastic in Christendom, yet never allows him to be, what he proclaims himself to be on pain of damnation to the dissenting, as the most authoritative ecclesiastic in Christendom? Will it not be time enough to impugn England, and her fellow-churchmen in these States, when it can be shown, how Rome can outface and put down the Church of Constantinople, the

i One sample will suffice. Theodore Balsamon, who died in 1204, was one of the ablest of the Greek canonists. He holds this language: "The Popes have separated, and are divided, from the four other Patriarchs." This is quoted by Mathew Scrivener, in his Body of Divinity, who well adds, "If four of the Patriarchs of the Church may be heretics and schismatics, what becomes of that argument for the true Church, taken from the *universality* of its profession?"—Scrivener's Divinity, bk i. pt 1, p. 235.

j According to Neue's Repertorium, there are in Protestant states, 193,624,000 inhabitants. In Roman Catholic, 134,164,000. In Greek, 60,000,000. This calculation, with allowance for variations, makes Protestants and Greeks greatly outnumber Roman Catholics!—*Kitto's Journal of Sac. Literature*, vol. vii., 454. For a view of the matter in olden time, consult Sir Edwin Sandy's Europæ Speculum, and his Travels. Also, Cerri's Account of the State of the Rom. Cath. Religion, translated by Sir Richard Steele. Warcupp's Italy, "its original glory, ruin, and revival," is a curious standard by which to compare the development of two centuries. It was printed in London, in 1660.

Church of Alexandria, the Church of Antioch, the Church of Jerusalem, the Church of Greece, the Church of Russia? She has never vanquished the arguments, never silenced the upbraidings, of her patriarchal equals.[k] Their accusations, and protests, and appeals, and disclaimers, and downright refusals, are on record still; as they have been for weary centuries. England and America but echo and reiterate them; and when Rome can subjugate and satisfy Protestant Germany, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Prussia—when all the East, with Greece, and Turkey, and colossal Russia, then, and not till then, will it be time enough for her to say, that England is one of her fiefs, by virtue of her possession of an *undisputed* supremacy. Till then, we may safely say, Supercilious pretender, your claims are a downright usurpation; and we can never listen to you for a moment, till you are a more effective demonstrator of your boundless assumptions.

II.—The second question of the issue under discussion, was to be, What indebtedness does England owe to Rome, on account of the pretension, that Christianity came first to British shores, through Romish instrumentality?

k Perhaps one way in which she contrived to keep them at bay was, to keep the Greek language out of Western Europe. This was so effectually done, that, as Ockley testifies, "Greek was not understood in this part of the world, till the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, A. D. 1453; when several learned Greeks escaping with their libraries, and coming westward, that language was restored."—*Ockley's Hist. Saracens*, Bohn's edition, pref. p. xvii. The Pope (Victor) who began with excommunications of the East, excommunicated the Greek tongue also! See note *r*, p. 15.

It is no doubt a fact, that Christianity was widely disseminated, by the instrumentality of the apostles themselves, in person. The last words uttered by Christ, on a globe wherein He died to bring it back to God, seemed to point precisely to such an eventuation.[l] It is true, that "the uttermost part of the earth" may here be taken in a rhetorical, rather than in a logical sense, and *may* mean, the uttermost part of the earth to be visited by them, *or* by their successors. But traditionary history throws such light upon the labors of the apostles, as to incline one to believe, the words are to be understood more literally than some apprehend. The apostles did not long continue, after Christ's Ascension, as they did *up to*, and *after* the "great persecution," which followed the martyrdom of Stephen.[m] They remained at first, and formally, a coherent body, to regulate doubtless, and to arrange, a thousand particulars, while *as yet* the New Testament was all unwritten, and the Christian Church had to be organized by oral, and not by recorded instruction, as was the Church of the elder dispensation. But they soon commenced Episcopal and missionary tours, such as became them, as the pioneers of a new faith, whose duty it was to carry it far and near, and whose geographical field of action was, literally, the world.[n] They took care, nevertheless, to make Jerusalem their common and habitual head-quarters. For it was here, and not at Rome, that St. Paul met St.

l "Ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."—Acts, i. 8. "World's end."—Tyndale and Cranmer.

m Acts, viii. 1.

n Matt. xiii. 38.

Peter by appointment.[o] It was here, so long as fourteen years afterwards, that Paul and Barnabas were enjoined to go, to communicate to the pillars of the Church their mode of addressing the Gospel to the Gentiles.[p] Peter was one of these pillars, and not a pillar of the Church of Rome. He was not the first or foremost of these pillars: James was that transcendent dignitary[q]—and their proper place, for meeting and concurrent action, seems to have been neither of those places which have been assigned to Peter as his own peculiar see, but the bishopric of Jerusalem, of which James was the undoubted head.[r] It was in Jerusalem, long years after the Ascension, that (not apostles, but) *the* apostles, with the elders and the brethren around them, met in solemn conclave,[s] and established the great canon which absolved the Gentiles from the practice of circumcision. It was *for* Jerusalem, if not *at* Jerusalem, that, even after the capture of that city by the Romans in the reign of Vespasian, there was an assembly of all the surviving apostles, and a multi-

o Gal. i. 18. *p* Gal. ii. 1, 2.

q Gal. ii. 9. Compare Millar's Propagation of Christianity, i. p. 298. Ordericus Vitalis (A. D. 1075–1141) considers James as "the common father" of the apostles and "their master."—Bohn's edit. vol. i. p. 248.

r James was made bishop of Jerusalem by Peter, James, and John.—*Eusebius*, bk ii. ch. 1. Rufinus, the Latin, says he was made "Bishop of the Apostles" by them. Rainolds, in his conference with Hart, (p. 432,) gave up Rufinus's reading—a thing no Jesuit would have done, had the variation favored Peter's supremacy. But, it may be, I am too severe. Stephen Gardiner, in his tract on True Obedience, in which he contends against the Pope, reads the text as Rufinus does!—*Brown's Fasciculus*, ii. p. 814. Stephen Gardiner against the Pope, and in favor of loyalty towards an anti-Papal monarch! Well, there are *some* Romish miracles which we must, per force, believe in!

s Acts, 15th.

tude of others, "from all parts," to elect and consecrate a bishop for Jerusalem, as the successor of James, who had died a martyr.[t]

Nevertheless, while Jerusalem was thus obviously regarded as the central see of Christendom, that one alone, and above all others, in which all Christians, from the highest to the lowest, had a common interest, it is a notorious fact of Church History, that the apostles did not make it a place of permanent residence, but simply of frequent, perhaps habitual, resort. They had no individual home. They ought not to have had; for they were missionaries for "all the world," bishops at large, patriarchs ecumenical, who, while they might plant ministerial successions in localities, had no special locality of their own. If St. John, in the days of his decrepitude, became the metropolitan of Ephesus,[u] (as seems evident from his epistles to seven diocesan Churches,) Paul clearly had no fixed home; and why Peter should be supposed to have one, rather than he, is a problem which Rome never *has* solved, and never *can* solve, but by conjectures which we have as good a right as herself to entertain.[v] She pretends, indeed, that St. Peter was at first the metropolitan of Antioch; but St. Paul once rebuked him at Antioch,[w] as if he were an in-

t Eusebius, bk iii. ch. 11.—Hind's Early Christianity, p. 243. Jerusalem, too, was probably a centre for charitable contributions "from all parts."—Acts, xi. 27–30; Rom. xv. 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 3.

u Eusebius, iii. 23. Bagster's Trans. p. 130.

v According to 1 Cor. ix. 5, Peter travelled about; and with his wife, too!—Eusebius, bk iii. ch. 30, tells us Peter's wife was a martyr. Of course, then, he must have lived with his wife, *after* he was appointed Pope!

w Gal. ii. 11.

truder upon *his own* territory; and he also slunk into insignificance at Antioch, before the legates of James,[x] sent, no doubt, to see if the canon of the Great Council about the Gentiles were duly executed. She pretends, also, that he was the metropolitan of Rome —yet he never wrote an epistle to the Romans; while St. Paul did, without honoring Peter in it by so much as the mention of his name.[y] She pretends that Peter, with St. Paul, established the present episcopate of Rome; which possibly he might have done (or Ignatius after him) when both went to Rome to suffer martyrdom. And if he did do it, it is no more than he did for the Church at Corinth;[z] yet, who ever heard that the Corinthians claimed, in consequence, a precedency over all Christendom beside themselves? The Church of Corinth had more of the Epistolary portion of the New Testament addressed to it than any other: St. Paul and St. Peter are its putative founders[a]—one, most manifestly, and the other believed to be so on respectable authority. Yet, who ever heard that the Church of Corinth ever plumed itself, because of such a distinction, or assumed any patriarchal supremacy, in so much as the little Kingdom of Greece?[b]

x Gal. ii. 12.

y So Ignatius wrote an epistle to the Romans; but never Peter. Dionysius, first bishop of Corinth, also wrote an epistle to the Romans.—*Eusebius*, bk ii. ch. 25.

z Polycarp made Bishop of Smyrna by "the apostles."—Beaven's Irenæus, p. 2, n. 3. Also, p. 58.

a It is evident, from 1 Cor. i. 12, that Peter had a party at Corinth, which looked up to him as a head, or as one of the founders of their Church.

b Eusebius, bk ii. § 25; bk iv. § 23. Tertullian tells the Churches of South Greece to defer to Corinth. De Præscr, Hær. § 36. Dodgson,

All this goes to show, that no one Christian Church, or see of the Christian Church, has a right to style itself the patron, the pattern, the paternal see, of any portion of Christendom, unless that of its immediate neighborhood, which might be dependent on it for support, and which it was more especially bound to superintend and nourish. And with such a premise before us, we might say, that if Christianity was introduced into England by St. Paul, or by St. Peter, after they had passed through Rome, and established *there* the genuine apostolic succession, this would no more prove England's subserviency to Rome, than it would prove the same for Grecian Corinth. Moreover, it is not possible to prove, that Christianity did enter into England *by the way* of Rome. Fuller, our well-known Church of England historian, goes carefully over the pretension that St. Peter, that St. James the son of Zebedee, that St. Paul, that St. Simon Zelotes, that Aristobulus one of the seventy,[c] that Claudia, the

i. 470. Eusebius, bk iv. 23, represents Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, as writing "Catholic Epistles," i. e. encyclical letters, like a modern Pope! He addresses Asia, and Rome, too! And his letters were of so much consequence, that they were cut, and hacked, and garbled, as the fathers are by the Papists!

c "Eusebius," says Dr. Burton, "certainly believed the Britons were converted as early as the apostolic age."—*Lectures*, i. 285. The Rev. Beale Poste, in his Britannic Researches, contends that Aristobulus brought Christianity into Britain.—*Poste's B. Researches*, London, 1853, p. 410. The Ven. John Williams, late Archdeacon of Cardigan, in a very ingenious tract, admits that Aristobulus preached Christianity in Britain; and contends that Claudia, mentioned 2 Tim. iv. 21, was a British princess. Archdeacon Williams's tract covers 58 pages, and was published in London, by Longman & Co., in 1848. Baronius, guided by a manuscript in the Vatican, says, that Joseph of Arimathea brought the Gospel to Britain, A. D. 35.—*Forbes's Historic Theology*, vol. i. p. 159; or, bk 3, ch. 30, n. 13.—*Chevallier's Apostolic Fathers*, etc., 2d edit. p. 363.

wife of Pudens mentioned in the second Epistle to Timothy, that Joseph of Arimathea with Lazarus and his sisters, are to have the especial honor of having introduced Christianity into Britain; and his conclusion, in review of the seven different suppositions, is as follows:—"By all this it doth not appear, that the first preachers of the Gospel in Britain did so much as touch at Rome; much less, that they received any command or commission thence to convert Britain, which should lay an eternal obligation of gratitude on this island to the see of Rome."[d] Indeed, it may now be quite impossible to ascertain *who* did inaugurate Christianity in Britain, since Gildas, the earliest of all the English historians, who lived and died[e] before papal Rome had any connexion with England whatever, says, that the early records of his country were all destroyed in wars, and he had to glean what he could from foreign sources, or from the narratives of exiles.[f]

I see not, then, but we must consign the early Christian history of Great Britain to the obscurity of con-

d Fuller's Ch. Hist., bk i. § 18; or, vol. i. p. 23, Brewer's edition, Oxford, 1845.

e In Glastonbury, say some, A. D. 570. In Bangor, others, A. D. 590. Du Pin dates his book A. D. 564.—*Ecc. Hist.*, i. 561. It was written in Armorica, or French Britain, according to Collier.—*Ecc. Hist.*, 8vo. ed., i. 144. Birckbeck says, that in "ancient charters" the Church of Glastonbury "was termed the grave of the saints, the mother church, the disciples' foundation."—*Protestants' Evidence*, 2d ed., p. 75. Of Glastonbury, as the Mother Church of England, and of Gildas, the father of English Historians, a work like Eugene Lawrence's, intended for Americans, might have given us some account. Yet of Gildas himself, a work, written professedly about English historians, gives us but the most meagre description.

f Giles's Gildas, p. 8.

jecture, and admit (what plainly we are quite obliged to do) that no one can tell us, with any satisfactory degree of certainty, to whom such a most interesting fact in the history of our forefathers, as the establishment of Christianity among them, is to be accredited. While, however, we can not speak of this fact in a *positive* way, we can undoubtedly speak of it in a *negative* way. We can maintain, that there is not a shadow of credible proof, to establish the hypothesis, that Christianity was brought into England, either *from* Rome, or *by* Rome. In fact, Gildas helps to this conclusion, since he declares that Christianity reached the shores of Britain in the latter part of the reign of Tiberius, who died A. D. 37.[g] And, beside, ample evidence will, by and by, come up to clear the way to the declaration, that, let Britain have been indebted for her Christian inheritance to whomsoever she may, Rome could not have been the patron to whom her thanks are due. Gildas himself illustrates this point, indirectly, but with singular effect; since, while he quotes the Scriptures abundantly, he never quotes the version of them current in his age at Rome.[h] This demonstrates, potentially, that from the first,

[g] Collier, i. 8, says in the apostles' times.—Prof. Richardson, in his Prælections, i. 231, says five or six years after Christ's Ascension. His version of Gildas sustains mine. Giles's Gildas, p. 10; and Ancient Britons, i. 198, 199. Blumhardt, Estab. of Christianity, i. 407, agrees. Hales's Prin. Brit. Ch., quotes a more crabbed version of Gildas, pp. 98, 99. Colossians, i. 23, may bear on the point. This Epistle dates, say, A. D. 64. Bergier, Theol. Dict., i. 127, dates Christianity in Britain as late as A. D. 182; and says Pope Eleutherius sent it. Cardinal Pole's admission, that Britain was the first of all islands that received the light of Christ's religion. Jones's Brit. Ch., pp. 132, 33. Soames's Reformation, iv. 260.

[h] Giles's Gildas, pref. p. viii.

England's Bible and Rome's Bible have been two very different things; and other early differences between England and her would-be mistress will in due time appear.

Let who may, then, have been nursing-fathers and nursing-mothers to Christianity in our father-land, the Church of Rome has no right nor title to consider these personages as her distinctive members.[i] She did not send them, she could not have sent them; for, (as Gildas has taught us,) Christianity in Britain is quite as old as Christianity in Italy[j]—so old there, that Christianity in Rome could give it no aid whatever; for, being itself in swaddling clothes, it had to struggle for so much as simple existence.[k]

In all human probability, Christianity took a more direct route to the British Islands, than through the capital of the empire. There was, *e. g.*, a remarkable connexion between the East and the City of Lyons on the Rhone. Lyons was, no doubt, in the earliest Christian ages the *first*, as it is still but the *second* city in France; it had been constituted a granary, an empori-

i "The ancient British Church, by whomsoever planted, was a stranger to the Bishop of Rome, and all his pretended authority."—*Blackstone's Commentaries*, bk iv. ch. 8.

j "We were converted nine years before Rome." Fullwood makes this assertion on the authority of Baronius and Suarez.—*Roma Ruit*, 2d ed. p. 30, note. "Rome is no mother Church to Britain, neither by conception, nor education; for she was neither conceived in her womb, nor nourished on her breast; but was a virgin of full age, when her pretended mother was in her swaddling clouts and cradle."—*T. Jones's British Church*, in 12mo. London, 1678. p. 150.

k As Fuller quaintly expresses it, "religion came into Britain, not by the semi-circle of Rome, but in a direct line from the Asiatic Churches."—*Ch. Hist.*, bk ii. cent. 7; or, vol. i. 150.

um, and often a sort of metropolis imperial, by the Roman emperors. It was in the most advantageous position for a grand centre of operations, at the confluence of two large rivers.[l] And, accordingly, we here find missionaries dispatched from the East (not from Rome) to disseminate Christianity throughout France; so that France, as well as England, is indebted for her religion, not at all to Italy, or to Italian emissaries. The first Bishop of Lyons was an Oriental;[m] its second Bishop also was an Oriental—the celebrated Irenæus, who was personally familiar with Polycarp, the angel of the Church of Smyrna, and the disciple of St. John.[n] In the latter part of the second century, as we learn from the 5th book of the History of Eusebius, there was a terrible persecution at Lyons and in its vicinity.[o] A long and interesting account of this

l Eusebius, bk v. chap. i., calls Lyons and Vienne "the two chief cities" of Gaul. Lyons oldest Ch. in France. Its Bishop a patriarch. Churton's Early Eng. Ch., new ed. p. 40—Compare Blondel, De la Primauté, chap. 30, p. 712.—Prof. Palma, in his Prælections, calls Irenæus Archbishop of Lyons.—Vol. i. p. 51. Rome, 1848. 2d ed. "*Cujus antistes*," says Miræus in his Notitiæ Episcopatuum, "*hodie Primatum cleri Gallicani obtinet.*"—Antwerp. 1613. p. 357. The Bishop of Lyons called the Archbishop of France.—Giles's Bede, ii. p. 363. By a curious coincidence, which some may like to be informed of, Lyons has a celebrity not to be rejoiced in. It is supposed to be the birthplace of Pontius Pilate.—*Mexio's Treasurie of Ancient and Modern Times.* Translation. London. 1613. p. 419, col. a.

m The first bishop of Lyons was Pothinus; who, says Mr. Oxlee, quoting a high French authority, was sent by Polycarp the disciple of St. John. His author gives this as current Gallican tradition. The French theory, then, undoubtedly is, that Lyons traces itself to St. John. —*Oxlee's Sermons on the Christian Hierarchy,* sermon 3d, p. 82.

n Irenæus was of course *originally* a member of the oriental, or Greek Church; and must have found Greek Christians around him in the West, as he wrote in the Greek language.

o Chap. i. bk v.

persecution was transmitted to what we might suppose would be the ecclesiastical head-quarters, for Christians of that locality and time. Beyond a question, a Romanist would say; and such an epistle, if sent, was of course sent to the palace of his Holiness in the city of seven hills. But it was not so sent, by any means. The Bishop of Rome was utterly ignored in it, and passed entirely by.[p] It was addressed to "brethren in Asia and Phrygia, having the same faith and hope;" who (the inference is natural, if not unavoidable,) are thereby designated as fathers in God to the Church in Lyons, and, through Lyons, of all the Churches of France.

The result of all this process undoubtedly is, to establish the conclusion, that Lyons, and Lyons in direct connexion with oriental Christendom, is the channel through which Christianity penetrated France, and the northern circumjacent countries.[q] This is the conclusion reached by the erudite and unwearied Mosheim, in a work more elaborate than his Institutes of Church History, and one of the most elaborate works ever written, to illustrate the rise and progress of Christianity—the conclusion to which he arrives, in his Commentaries on the early affairs of the Christian Church. He declares, that it is proved to a demon-

p All this, too, when Lyons *could* write a hortatory letter to Rome, and even an objurgatory one, to induce it to keep the peace of the Church. —Eusebius, bk v. 3, at end; v. 24, in the middle. For the last statement, Cardinal Perron pours *abuse* upon Eusebius. This proves its truth. The Cardinal would *disprove* Eusebius's allegation, if he could. He cannot, so he slanders him.—*Perron's Reply to King James*, bk ii. chap. 6.

q So Neander, Ch. Hist., i. 114–117, Eng. ed.

stration, that no legates from Rome, but devout men from Asia, established Christian discipline among the ancient Britons.[r]

The process which has been followed out may have been a somewhat tedious one; but the end reached will amply compensate for all the fatigue it has cost to reach it. For it establishes the cardinal fact, that the paternity of Christian missions in France and England is due to that quarter of the world where St. John spent the latest of his days, and where he wrote the striking Epistles to the Asiatic Churches, which we find in the book of Revelations. The seven Churches mentioned in that book were all of them in proconsular Asia, (a territory far less extensive than what we now call Asia Minor,) or in Phrygia. And as it was with the Churches in proconsular Asia and in Phrygia, that the Church in Lyons communicated in the hour of its deepest sorrow, so doubtless it was to these Churches, that the foundation of Christianity is due for France, and for regions further northward and westward—indeed, for all that portion of the globe which has given a character to humanity, and exercised a sway over its noblest welfare, that Popery well may envy. France has never been Popery's sure and certain ally; for there has been a school of theology fostered on Gallican soil, which has made

r Mosheim de Rebus, etc., p. 216, of the Latin copy which reads "*ad demonstrandum*," vol. i. 273, Murdock's translation. Gibbon (ch. xv., note 18,) calls this a "masterly performance;" and he says he shall *often* have occasion to quote it.—Prof. Palma, Pius IX.'s teacher of Ch. History, quotes it, and appropriates its language.—Palma's Prælections, i pp. 22, 23, 52.

Popery writhe and quail, more, if possible, than the unbending Protestantism of England.[s] This school has not yet died out; and France may one day be

s Bossuet's great work *Defensio Cleri Gallicani* (a quarto of 1024 pages) is a magazine upon this subject. The power of this work, much as Bossuet had done for Romanism in other ways, constrained Rome to put it into her Index.—*Rose's Biog. Dict.*, iv. 461. Maimbourg, (a Jesuit,) who followed the lead of Bossuet, was expelled from his order by the command of the Pope himself; and, but for the protection of his king, might have languished in a dungeon, as the Benedictine Barnes did for thirty years! Hontheim (*alias* Febronius,) suffragan to the Abp. of Treves, gave, says Næbe, an incurable wound to Papal pretensions.—*Næbe's Ecc. Hist.*, pp. 477, 478. If long wincing is a sign of great hurts, then Næbe is right about Hontheim's work; and a saying of the celebrated Charles Leslie was not too severe: "A French Papist would be burnt at Rome for a heretic, if they durst." This sentence is quoted from a work of Leslie's, now but little known; but which contains much of that peculiar talent for which Dr. Johnson complimented his other works.—*The Rehearsal*, 2d ed. London, 1750, vol. v. p. 35. The celebrated Abauzit well understood the ecclesiastical character of his countrymen, measured by Romish instruments. He speaks, in his famous letter to a lady of Dijon, of "the *heresy of the French*, who, during several centuries, rejected the second Council of Nice [A. D. 787;] and who, I do not know by what fatality, are almost always the last to receive the decisions of the [Roman] Church."—*Abauzit's Miscellanies.* London, 1774, p. 92. But it is useless to identify a series, whose succession yet continues. In 1817, was published Abp. De Barral's defence of the same liberties, for which Bossuet was a champion in 1682.

According to Guicciardini, France was on the eve of separation from Rome, at the time England was contemplating that act.—*Hist. of the Wars in Italy*, vol. x. p. 232. So also in Henry IV.'s time.—*Sandys, Europæ Speculum*, p. 259. It is well known how Richelieu and Louis XIV. braved the Popedom, without much ceremony.—*Robson's Life of Richelieu*, p. 392. And why should this be wonderful? The little kingdom of Portugal has done the same thing—has caused a book, as bad as Hontheim's, (*Pereira's Theologia Tentativa,*) to be published under the sanction of her prime minister; and has at last confiscated *all* the Church property!—*Dumouriez's Portugal*, p. 190. *Oldknow's Month in Portugal*, pp. 37, 38. Indeed, men like Sir Robert Cotton, and the great antiquary Selden, were wont to declare, that they "could show undoubted testimonies," that all the princes of Europe envied Henry VIII.'s ecclesiastical independence, and would gladly have imitated him, if they durst.—*Hacket's Life prefixed to his Sermons*, p. xlii.

religiously the ally of England, as much as she now is politically, in spite of the Vatican, which must of course condemn all alliance with heresy, as criminal and perilous and degrading.[t]

The East then, and not Italy, not the head of an Italian Church, may claim the honor of giving Christianity to those countries, which are now at the head of all civilized nations. France and England have, in consequence, little to thank Rome for. And had the affinity which began in the East been assiduously retained—were it the custom *now* for the Church of France to correspond, as in the days of Irenæus at Lyons, with the Churches of Asia Minor, rather than with the Church of Rome—were it the custom *now* for British bishops to follow, as they once did, Oriental and not Roman customs, and to be present, as I must show they were, in French and Oriental councils—the union between the East and the West might have been maintained, in despite of Rome; and the Christian world never have been riven asunder. It was Rome which began the great schism that divided the East from the West;[u] and Rome's Church there-

t It was once the fashion to abuse Frenchmen at Rome, and call them, "as in way of disgrace, The Parliament Catholics."—*Sandys's Europæ Speculum*, p. 259. While but for Frenchmen, the Pope might, this very moment, be a fugitive and an exile! Sandys says, the French lawyers were then particularly dreaded at Rome. Such men as D'Aguesseau might well be. There is no man a rogue dreads more than an *honest* lawyer!

u See Milman's Gibbon, ch. 21, at notes 115 and 126, or vol. iii. 361, 367. Gibbon confirmed by Socrates, bk ii. ch. 22; and Sozomen, bk iii. ch. 13. The stand taken in favor of appeals to Rome at the Council of Sardica, A. D. 347, began the great schism which has never been healed. If Rome would abate her claims about absolute, imperial, world-

fore ought to be the last of all Churches to complain of schism, and especially of schism on a smaller scale, and as levelled against herself. She has stamped schism, as a hideous and indelible fact on the Church's history, for more than a thousand years; and if schism has damaged her irreparably (as it has done in her own favorite West) she is rightfully recompensed, for her reckless alienation from all who will not be her abject vassals. So say the Oriental Patriarchs to the present day, and so say we; and if the time might come, when the Protestant East could unite with the Protestant West, and utter a harmonious voice, Popery would be left to an insignificance, which none would be poor enough to honor.[v]

wide sovereignty, the unity of Christendom might be restored. The Papacy, therefore, is the grandest hindrance to unity under heaven. "It is delightful," says Dr. Townsend, "to review the manner in which, till the conduct of the Bishop of Rome began to produce alienation of Church from Church, the universal, holy, apostolic Church of Christ was composed of many Episcopal communions, which unitedly formed the one Church."—*Townsend's Ecclesiastical and Civil History Philosophically Considered*, i. 201. "They," said even Mr. Newman, when in his right mind, "they [i. e. the Romanists] cut themselves off from the rest of Christendom; we cut ourselves off from no branch, not even from themselves."—*Newman's Lectures on Romanism and Popular Protestantism*. London, 1838, p. 260. "This papal supremacy alone stands in the way to oppose a glorious re-union of all the Christian Churches."—*Leslie's Works*, new ed. iii. 469, comp. p. 167.

v "There are few things Rome would more dread, than an intimate connexion between the Greek and Anglican Churches."—*Masson's Apology for the Greek Church*. London, 1844, p. 90. "Since the separation of the Eastern and Western communions, the efforts of Rome have been unremitted to accomplish the *subjugation* of the Oriental Church."—*Ibid*, p. 86. Masson was a judge of the Court of Areopagus; and previously, attorney-general for the Morea. In 1848, Pio Nono addressed a letter to the Orientals, exhorting them to unity. The Greek Patriarchs published a reply, in which they class Popery among the heresies.—*Journal of the Malta College Committee*. London, 1854, p. 777.

O, come that day, big with the fate of Christianity's dearest destinies! Come that day, when the grand disturber of Christian concord will be unmistakingly known to the Christian world! Come that day, when the catholicity of primitive times shall be revived, and the bastard catholicity of Italy shall no longer be the watchword of hopeful but deluded nations! God hasten it in His time! Rome with its Trentine Council, which not all even of Roman Christendom receives implicitly, is not, and cannot be, the representative of Christianity at large. Nay, it is not the representative of the Christianity which once inhabited its own walls; and I cannot do better, perhaps, than by quoting, for the fortification of such a sentiment, the language of a divine, who has long slept with his fathers, but who, being dead, may yet speak authoritatively in Christian pulpits. Why, he exclaims in holy indignation, why should any one "call the Christian Faith the Roman Faith, rather than the Faith of Jerusalem, or the Faith of Antioch; seeing it issued from the former, and was received and first named in the latter city, before any spark of Christianity was kindled at Rome?" And he adds, as a clincher to the pertinency of his question, a Jesuit "may sooner prove the modern Italian tongue, now spoken in Rome, to be the self-same in propriety and purity with the Latin language in Tully's time, than that the religion professed in that city at this day, with all the errors and superstitions thereof, is the same, in soundness of doctrine and sanctity of life, with that

faith which by St. Paul in the Roman Church was once so highly commended."—(Fuller's Church History, i. 24.)[w]

w "Cujus ultima non correspondent primis," says Clemangis, in a passage already quoted. "Let men say what they can," exclaims Fleury, "it is evident that the first ages furnished a much greater number of holy popes than the last ones; and that the morals and discipline of the Romish Church were *then* very much more pure."—*Fleury's Histoire Ecclesiastique*, vol. xvi. p. xx. Had Fleury opened his mouth in this style at Rome, he would have been entitled, like poor Barnes, to a thirty years' retirement!

LECTURE II.

SKETCH OF THE CHRISTIAN HISTORY OF BRITAIN, TO THE INVASION OF THE PAGAN SAXONS, AND THE RETREAT OF THE CHRISTIAN BRITONS INTO WALES AND CORNWALL.

In the preceding lecture I endeavored to show, that Christianity did not take its rise in Rome, but in the East. That Rome had so little to do with the origination and dissemination of earliest Christianity, that she neither inaugurated the word *Christian*, nor the word *Catholic;* both of which, and the meaning and spirit of which, started and grew up in the East, when Rome was in her religious infancy, and but one of the many scattered colonies of Christendom.

I then entered, formally, upon an answer to two questions,—viz.: What does Britain owe to Rome, on account of her claim to universal dominion? and, What, on account of the claim, that Christianity came first to her shores, through Romish instrumentality? The answers to these questions were, substantially, as follows:—To the first, that Rome was but one of the five Patriarchates, into which Christendom was primitively divided—that it had no headship among these equals, but one of courtesy and of dignity—that its

headship of authority was disputed by them, from the first, and is disputed still—and that England owes no more deference to Rome, than its old and still protesting associates.

To the second,—That Rome had nothing to do with planting Christianity in Britain; but that this grand accomplishment in British history is due to the Christians of the East, who, probably, brought Christianity into France—while from Lyons in France it spread extensively into adjacent countries; Lyons having been made by the Roman emperors a territorial centre.[a]

The conclusion was, that Christianity, both in France and in England, owes little or nothing to Rome; which received *her* Christianity, as they did *their*s, through the missions of Oriental Christians. Rome, consequently, has not so much title (if any) to the gratitude of France and England, as has Asia Minor;[b] with

a To show the connexion between ancient France and Britain, scholars sometimes appeal to the identity of their language. "The British tongue, which, at this day, is in use among the Welsh in England, and the Britains [inhabitants of Brittany] in France, is but the reliques of that tongue which both the old Britains and Gauls used."—*Gale's Court of the Gentiles*, vol. i. p. 57.

b Britain was known in the East long before it was known at Rome. "But the most certain indication of the trade carried on by the Phœnicians in Britain, is the fact, that tin was an article in daily use among the Greeks, even as early as the days of Homer."—*Giles's Ancient Britons*, i. p. 12. This tin was obtained from Cornwall; and a knowledge of the trade by which it was obtained was carefully concealed from the Romans.—*Strabo's Geography*, Bohn's edition, i. pp. 262, 263. The Greek of Strabo may be found in the second volume of Dr. Giles's Ancient Britons—a volume of great value, made up of Greek and Latin excerpts from very many sources, illustrating ancient British history. The learned Theophilus Gale confirms Strabo's opinion, that the Phœnicians visited Cornwall for tin, and derives the word *Britain*, or, rather *Brittania*, from

which, France (at least) in the days of her primitive history, was in the habit of holding frequent and close communication.

We come now to the third and last question, proposed in the last lecture, bearing upon the affinities supposed to exist between ancient Britain and the popedom of Italy; and are, at present, to ascertain what obligation Britain owes to this popedom, on the pretence, that if the Church of Rome did not introduce Christianity into our father-land, *at the first*, it nevertheless *re-introduced* it, when Christianity there had relapsed into Paganism, and had actually disappeared from British soil.

Rome is a wily strategist, with which to deal. When quite beaten off from one post, she flies back to a second behind it, and argues from that standpoint, as coolly as if never defeated at any other. When we prove that Rome had no vicegerency over ancient Britain, by virtue of her Western Patriarchate, and none by her pretended planting of Christianity originally on British territory, then we begin to hear lispings about the connexion between Rome and Britain, in the second century. The first century has fairly to

two Syriac words, signifying *The Land of Tin.—Gale's Court of the Gentiles*, book i. ch. 9; or, vol. i. p. 55. Some have inferred the connexion of Britain with the East, not from the facts of trade, or philology, but from points of analogy between Judaism and Druidism. "If the religion of Britain had been *invented*, without any communication with the Eastern world, why did its inventors happen to have not only the same notions of the Deity, but likewise to adore Him under the same similitude?" —*Identity between the Druidical and Hebrew Religions*, London, 1829, p. 13. It is a curious fact, that the oak should have been a religious tree, to the Jew, as well as to the Briton. See Joshua, xxiv. 26; Judges, vi. 11; Isa. i. 29.

be abandoned, as a forlorn hope; but the second offers something whereon "to hope again"—and about that, I must now proceed to give you some sketch, of one of Rome's ecclesiastical romances.

It is assumed, on the authority of the so-called Venerable Bede, (another of the early British historians) that, in the latter part of the second century, Lucius the King of Britain[c] applied to the Bishop of Rome, in order to be made a Christian. Now the very chapter of Bede's history which refers to this event contains most serious chronological errors; and the whole affair, though it must have happened at a period, when the Church had a season of favorable rest, is utterly ignored by Eusebius, who well knew, as his history shows, what happened at Rome in the same period relative to the general interests of Christianity.[d]

Moreover, it is always safer to trust to historical documents (such particularly as letters,) than to the sur-

c Bede, book i. ch. 4. Comp. Fullwood's Roma Ruit. p. 31, note. Lucius's whole story doubted by Tillemont, whom Gibbon praises so highly for "his scrupulous minuteness."—*Britons and Saxons not Converted to Popery*, London, 1748, pp. 276, 277. Dr. Burton treats the story of Lucius as a fable.—*Lectures*, ii. 206.

d Eusebius, bk v. ch. 21. Bower's Popes, i. 33. Bede is the chief authority for the story of Lucius; and he quoted from an old Liber Pontificalis, which the author of "Britons and Saxons, etc.," p. 276, calls a "silly, ill-contrived book." Bishop Pearson also traces Bede's authority, as the Liber Pontificalis.—*Minor Works*, ii. 409. This Lib. Pontificalis, according to Mr. Oxlee, so learned in ancient lore, "is replete with inaccuracy, as well in the dates of the episcopates, as in the names of the first pontiffs." He speaks of portions of it as laboring "under the foulest suspicion."—*Oxlee's Sermons on the Hierarchy*, sermon 3d, p. 9. We now see the value of the *ultimate authority* about the story, or romance, of Lucius.

mises and comments of historians themselves. Now it happens, that there is a letter on record, purporting to have been written by the Bishop of Rome, to King Lucius, which poorly accords with the Popish version of that ancient monarch's application. According to this letter, he does not ask for conversion, but for law, (the Roman laws and the emperor's laws[e]) that he might use them in the administration of his kingdom. The answer informed him, that, in respect to *such* laws, he, the pastor of a Christian flock, had nothing to do, or say; while, in respect to religious laws, if he wanted guidance, the same answer informed him that he possessed the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and that, *in them*, he would discover all the aid which he needed. This cautious abstinence from interference with temporal sovereignties, and this remission of King Lucius to his Bible, shows that the Roman bishop of those days looked upon him as capable of supplying all his *political*, and all his *religious* necessities, without any special tutelage on his part; and is only compatible with the supposition, that the king was an independent monarch, and an independent Christian, already—at least, so far as respects any superintendence or guidance of the (so-called) Holy See. And as to the epistle itself, if a pope ever wrote it, then it is ten thousand pities that his mantle has not fallen

e T. Jones's British Church, p. 143. Archdeacon Williams very properly suggests, that he wanted these laws, to see how they affected the Church, and to use them as guides.—*Antiquities of the Cymry*, p. 67. Such an idea, of course, implies that the Christian religion was no novelty to him. The Archdeacon defends (p. 68, note) the authenticity of the letter of Eleutherius.

upon the shoulders of his numerous successors. If the present inheritor of his three-fold crown would imitate *still* (as at first perhaps he was inclined to do) his truly apostolic example—would, like him, abstain from laying a rude hand upon temporal authority, and send religious inquirers to their Bibles, we would all dub him the Prince of Protestants, and award him, with joyful homage, what the creed of Pope Pius demands for the images of canonized saints, "due honor and veneration."*f*

The story of King Lucius is evidently too lame a one to beguile any souls, but unstable ones; and so we may quietly pass it by, and approach the next most eminent period in British religious history, to ascertain what connexion *then* subsisted between it and the capital of Italy and the empire.

f The strongest argument against the story of Lucius is, that Rome established no jurisdiction under it, as under the mission of Augustine. Had she inaugurated Christianity in Britain under him, she would have done so, eagerly and carefully. Mosheim supplies us with another, that if the Britons received their religion from Rome, they would have followed Roman ecclesiastical customs; which, most notoriously, they did not.—*Commentaries by Murdock*, i. 272. Godwin says the story of Lucius was a good deal doubted in his day.—*De Præsulibus*, p. 25. London, 1616. Carte rejects it entirely; and Carte is one of five, whom Mr. Southey, in his *Vindiciæ*, p. 243, has classed among "the most sagacious, the most impartial, the most laborious, and the most accurate of our historians."—*Carte's England*, i. 132, 3. Mr. Soames says, that if the missionaries of the Pope *did* come, they found a church in Glastonbury, more than a hundred years old!—*Soames's Latin Church during Anglo-Saxon Times*, p. 39. Birkbeck says, that Lucius sent for preachers, to help him in his work of Christianizing—which is the whole story, if there is any truth in it.—*Protestants' Evidence*, p. 87. Such was the opinion of Bp. Andrews.—*Response to Bellarmine*, new edition, p. 40. The diploma of King Arthur, A. D. 531, says, that Lucius was converted by doctors from Cambridge.—*Ayliffe's State of the University of Oxford*, London, 1714. Appendix to vol. ii. pp. i. ii.

Of the history of Christianity in Britain, from A. D. 200 to A. D. 300, no authentic records, whatever, remain. We are assured by Gildas, that Christianity lasted through (*permansêre*)[g] all vicissitudes, from the reign of Tiberius, under whom Christ was crucified, to the great persecution which commenced under Diocletian, in A. D. 303, when Christianity itself was well nigh crucified, or driven away as a fugitive and a vagabond from the haunts of men. But political changes, persecutions, and civil wars, obliterated, in Britain, all those historical documents and monuments, on which we might have placed stable dependence, for a knowledge of its internal condition.[h] It was something to outlive the troubles of such a period of commotion and desolation,—to last it out, as the modest historian has expressed himself, understating, rather than overstating, his country's Christian vigor. We can, however, glean from the reminiscences of this period, the general conclusion, that Christianity extended itself, and prevailed quite widely. One strong encouragement to this conclusion arises from the fact, that the superstition of the ancient Druids, (the ancient pagans of our father-land,) disappeared entirely, after the opening of the second century.[i] The inference is

g Giles's Gildas has the Latin accompanying the English; and Gildas, in Latin, may also be found in Giles's Ancient Britons, vol. ii. p. 231, etc.

h Giles's Gildas, pp. 8, 9.

i Churton's Early English Ch. p. 4, new edition. Seldeni Opera, vol. iv. col. 898. The Romans endeavored to destroy the Druidical superstition.—Tacitus Annals, bk xiv. 30. But, as Blumhardt well says, the Britons hated "the new idolatry" which the Romans substituted. Establishment du Christianisme, i. 416. So Christianity was its only effectual substitute. Yet, Druidism had its strongest hold in Britain; the chief priest of it residing there. Noel's Dict. de la Fable, vol. i. p. 486.

a credible and a fair one, that so prevalent a superstition could have been supplanted by nothing but the religion which in the next century diffused itself so generally: in other words, that in this now dark period of history, Christianity struggled successfully with a terrific and bloody form of paganism, and triumphantly vanquished it. And, too, as we may be comfortably assured, without any bolstering or underpropping from Rome; since, had Rome had aught to do in compassing such a triumph, she would not have failed of braggarts to develop it, in shapes as numerous as the disguises of a Jesuit.

We must come, therefore, to the fourth century, for our next stopping-place in this historic disquisition.

Early in this century, (say from A. D. 303, the date of Diocletian's edict, which began the last and the severest of the ten ancient persecutions of Christianity, to A. D. 311, the date of the edict of Galerius, which first caused this persecution to abate,) the Church of Britain suffered intensely and incessantly, under an onslaught, which was supposed to have exterminated all regular worship of Jesus Christ.[j] It was during this frightful persecution that Alban, once a Roman officer, became a convert to the Christian faith, and heroically suffered martyrdom, at the Roman town of Verulam, which has since been called St. Albans[k] in honor of his consecrated memory. Oppressed and down-trodden, as the Christians of this period

j Jeremie's Hist. of the Christian Church, in the second and third centuries, p. 71.

k St. Albans is in Hertfordshire, some twenty miles N.N.W. of London

were, they were so numerous, and so devoted, that, when peace returned, they erected a church of such durability, over the scene of St. Alban's sufferings,[l] that it was standing in Bede's time, four hundred years afterwards, to commemorate the virtues of the first well-known martyr of the Church of England.[m] Christianity must have been conspicuous and general in Britain, in those days, if such as Alban were induced to die for it; and if, after the most fearful baptism of blood and fire, which it experienced in ancient times, it still, right away, grew strong enough to erect almost imperishable cathedrals, over the ashes of its votaries,[n] it ought to have attracted Rome's observation; and it would have done so, if Rome could have thereby acquired any merit, or glory, or strength, for herself—i. e., on the supposition that Rome then was what she became afterwards. But, though the Philippians, far away in the East, could send Epaphroditus to Rome, for the aid of St. Paul, in his hours of destitution and peril, (as we learn from his own epistle to the generous Christians at Philippi,) we do not find that Rome, though she could talk

l "Mirandi operis, et ejus martyrio condigna."—Bede, bk i. ch. 7, near end.

m Churton, p. 7. Chronicles Anc. Brit. Ch. second edit. 1851, p. 133.

n *Giles's Gildas*, Hist. § 12. "In less than ten years, etc." The British Church, and the French Church, too, of these days, were probably *self-supporting* Churches. "But the bishops of Gaul and Britain did not think it proper to be thus supported by the exchequer, and chose rather to live upon their own pocket."—*Collier's Ecc. Hist.* 8vo. edit. i. 85. Compare *Sulpitii Severi, Sac. Hist.* lib. ii. ch. iv. p. 420. They showed their high-minded and incorruptible independence, too, by such conduct. They were attending a Council; and while others were maintained "at the emperor's charge," they refused to accept the privilege.

loudly enough about excommunications,[o] could send any missionary to Britain, to pour in oil and wine, while she lay, like the Samaritan by the way-side, bleeding and exhausted.

No; Rome had no tender recollections of Britain, when she was likely to cost her nothing but toil and treasure: when the pallium of an archbishop, which (as we shall see) she could send at an auspicious period, would only bring swift destruction upon its wearer. And as little anxious recollection had she of her, in the latter part of this same century, when she suffered from enemies worse, in some respects, than vindictive anti-Christian emperors.

The British Church, having been cruelly afflicted by enemies *without*, began, at this period, to be troubled by enemies *within*. Arianism, which had created such formidable disturbances in the East,

o I allude here, of course, to such things as Victor's excommunication of the Oriental Churches, because of the controversy about Easter, in A. D. 196. This is usually called *his* excommunication of *them;* but, really, it was his abscission of himself from the Church Catholic, and the proving his Church to be anti-Catholic—a title which I believe to be her proper one, according to a very ancient authority. Said Firmilian, metropolitan of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who, in A. D. 256, defended Cyprian, metropolitan of Carthage, and a Roman saint, against the threats of Stephen, patriarch of Rome, "Whilst you [Stephen] think it in your power to excommunicate all the world, you have only separated yourself from the communion of the whole Catholic Church." —*Marshall's Cyprian*, part ii. p. 263. By her violent and unmitigated exclusiveness, Rome has put herself in a state of separation from the Catholic body of Christ, and become a mere anti-Catholic separatist, and nothing better. Mr. Newman understood this well enough, when he was an independent thinker, and had not put on the strait-waistcoat of Popery. "They [the Romanists, as he then habitually called them] cut themselves off from the rest of Christendom."—*Newman's Lectures on Popular Protestantism, etc.*, second edition, London, 1838, p. 260.

continued to disseminate itself, and reached the British coast, probably about the close of the fourth century, i. e., A. D. 400.[p] It had been formally condemned, seventy-five years previously, at the great Council of Nice; but it found a refuge among the uncultivated and ferocious Goths and Vandals, and was, in their hands, a blasting scourge to Europe for hundreds of years afterwards.[q] Some of its emissaries appear to have reached England; but made no great impression there in a direct way, though they might have fomented a heresy, which soon broke out in that country with portentous violence—I allude to the heresy which has taken its name from Pelagius, a native of ancient Wales.[r] Pelagius was a recluse,

p Giles's Gildas, p. 12, § 12. Bede, bk i. 8. Bishop Stillingfleet, in his Origines Britannicæ, questions the correctness of the charge about Arianism. Dr. Lingard passes it over in silence. Alban Butler believes it.—*Lives of the Saints*, Dublin, 1833, i. 684. So does Archdeacon Williams, who acutely says, that *both* Gildas and Bede have described Unitarianism, by one of its legitimate effects, viz., disposing people to be "always fond of hearing something new, and holding nothing with firmness." If Britain was, at this time, filled with cravers after novelties, and theological whifflers, the Unitarians must certainly have found their way into it.—*Antiquities of the Cymry*, p. 246.

q It is a fashion for deniers of the Trinity to esteem themselves, *par eminence*, Christian. It would be well for them, occasionally, to remember, that the Goths and Vandals belonged to *their* party. It is nothing new for errorists to claim perfection. A sceptic will often tell us, he is a better man than any member of a Church. "The Arian heretics, in their day, would allow none but themselves to be Catholics."—*Gibson's Preservative*, vol. xii. p. 4. Compare *Socrates, Ecc. Hist.*, bk ii. ch. 37, or p. 139, Bohn's ed. The observing reader will here note the curious parallel, between the old Arians and some pretty notorious people in modern times, who keep the best names for themselves alone.

r For Pelagius, and for Pelagianism in Britain, see Bede, bk i. chaps. 10, 17, 21. For a fuller modern account, *Thackeray's Researches*, London, 1843, ii. 124, etc. Cardinal Noris, *Hist. Pelagianæ*, professes to give an account derived from the sources which Bede copied, lib. ii. ch. v.—

who lived among his books, and fed on theological reveries, till he began to fancy human nature all goodness, and that it had never experienced such a catastrophe as the Fall. His system was formally condemned by the Church Catholic, about a century subsequently to the condemnation of Arianism; but having originated, or been developed in England, it was likely to do there an incredible amount of mischief. The Church of England felt herself hardly competent to encounter, single-handed, the perils by which it was menaced. Pelagianism (like modern Unitarianism) teaching man that he is his own Redeemer, was of course peculiarly flattering to self-conceit and vanity; and British Christianity might have succumbed before its plausibility and sophistic arts. What was to be done, in the critical and agitating exigency? Why, flee at once to Rome, a Papist would eagerly exclaim; she has a panacea for every disease ecclesiastical. Yes, as much as she had, when martyrs like St. Alban lay expiring on British soil; or when Churches like Alban's Abbey needed funds for its erection. Rome was *not* the recourse of Brittain, when the clouds of heresy were darkening in her firmament, and threatening to extinguish her Christ-given candlestick, or to remove it out of its place.[s]

The most elaborate history of Pelagianism was written by a Dutch divine, G. J. Vossius. This work was highly complimented by Archbishop Laud.—*Church Review*, Jan. 1854, p. 541.

[s] Dr. Lingard, in his Anglo-Saxons, would fain have us believe that a pope *did* incite France to help England. Dr. Hales, in his Primitive Church of the British Isles, (p. 132, etc.,) denies and disproves the supposition. The Jesuit, Sirmond, says that the authority on which the Pope's interference is grounded is an interpolation.—*Britons and Saxons*

No; France came then to her rescue, as probably she had done aforetime; for, again and again, had Britain applied to the highest Roman authorities, and in vain. I say, to Roman authorities, meaning more particularly Roman civil (yet Christian) authorities; to which Britain could send an epistle which she literally called her groans, and which, like the cry of the helpless in the desert, or on the wide salt sea, was wasted upon empty air.[t] And if *political* Rome were thus deaf and blind, there is no evidence to show that *ecclesiastical* Rome was any less so. Indeed, the application to France may but indicate, that it was requisite to try other means of help, than could be given or promised by the chief bishop of the empire and the putative father of Christendom.

But France came readily (did she not?) to the rescue. Aye, most cheerfully, and magnanimously. Not a congregation, or city merely, of the country, but its clergy generally, were thrown into commotion, for the necessities of their brethren across the Straits of Dover. A council ("a great synod," as Bede styles it,)[u] came together; and that synod deputed two of its most considerable members, to hasten into England

not Converted to Popery, pp. 292, 293. The old story, then, a Roman forgery! Prof. Rees argues against the interposition of the Pope, because he says the Pope and the Church of France were *then* at variance.—*Essay on the Welsh Saints*, p. 120. It is possible that the French remembered the obligations of their ancestors; for the grand reason assigned by Julius Cæsar himself for his invasion of Britain, was, that the Britons helped the French in his wars in Gaul. "Quod omnibus fere Gallicis bellis, hostibus nostris inde subministrata auxilia intelligebat."—*Cæsar de Bello Gallico*, lib. iv. ed. 1670, p 142.

t Fuller's Ch. Hist. i. 70. Bede, bk i. ch. 14.

u Bede, bk i. ch. 17. Giles's Bede, vol. ii. p. 77.

on an errand of conference and succor. This council assembled at Troyes, some ninety miles south-east of the present city of Paris; and the bishop of that city, with the bishop of the neighboring city of Auxerre, immediately hied themselves away to England, to fulfil their fraternal mission.

And they did not labor in that mission half-heartedly, or in vain. With Gallic vivacity and suppleness, they taught the slower Briton how to vanquish the crafty Pelagian, in his most seducing arguments.[v] They challenged the champions of heresy to open debate, at Verulam, where the ashes of St. Alban were reposing; and over those ashes obtained for catholic truth a signal and crowning victory.[w] And again, too, years subsequently, did bishops of France bestir themselves for the British Church, and visit England on a similar mission of fraternal affection and devotion. Pelagianism, like the Lernean hydra, raised fresh heads, when some of its former ones had been shorn off. But French sympathy, and learning, and zeal, and prowess, were again at hand, to upgird the weak, and animate the timid; and, a second time, victory under Gallican auspices perched upon English banners. The issue is thus stated by Bede, and is well worthy mention, to show that the worst which our British forefathers did with a heretic, was to dismiss him quietly from their territory. England never learned the use of faggots and flames, till

v France celebrated then for its oratory. British students went there to study law.—*Juvenal*, Satire xv. iii. Madan's ed. and note.

w Bede, bk i. ch. 21.

Romish tuition had seared her conscience, and petrified her temper. "By the judgment of all," says the historian, "the originators of the heresy, who had been expelled the island, were brought before the priests to be conveyed up into the continent, that the country might be rid of them, and they corrected of their errors."[x] That was the ancient British, unromanized, way of treating heretics. In military phrase, they were merely drummed out of camp; they were not even incarcerated, or maimed—still less were they turned into smoke and ashes at the stake.

These things happened about the middle of the 5th century, (i. e. A. D. 450) and from this time onward, 150 years, there is little to be said, in any way, of the ecclesiastical history of Britain. Evidently the British Church was one of no inconsiderable strength, to throw off and exterminate (if not alone) such heresies as Arianism and Pelagianism—both of which tasked the energies of ecumenical councils, and the first of which was not suppressed, in such a country as Spain, till the sixth century had well nigh expired.[y] It had martyrs like St. Alban, who has given his name to a dukedom, if not to a bishop's see.[z] It had confessors like St. Keby,[a] who has given a name to Holy-Head, his favorite residence—familiar to every voyager to Liverpool. It had pilgrims[b] who could wend their

x Bede, bk i. ch. 21.—Giles's Bede, vol. ii. p. 93.

y Riddle's Chronology, A. D. 589.

z Churton, p. 7, note.

a Or Cybi, pronounced *Kubby*.—Lives of the Cambro-British Saints. Llandovery, 1853. pp. 495–501.

b Eccleston's English Antiquities, p. 12. "Their often journeying to Palestine."—Twysden's Vindication, chap. ii.

way into far-off Syria, and into the capital of Palestine, the central home of Christianity. It had historians, like Gildas, who could arraign the loftiest in Church and State for their shortcomings. It had Church dignitaries,[c] a Bishop of York and a Bishop of London, (not to mention others) to send to a French council, in south France, in A. D. 314:—it sent representatives, as is altogether probable, to the grand council of Nice, in A. D. 325:[d]—it sent the same to the council of Sardica, in *ancient* Thrace, in A. D. 347:—the same to an Italian council, at Rimini, in A. D. 359. It could, also, not only support itself,[e] but send forth missionaries to diffuse the faith which blessed itself; for it is indisputable, that the Britons, even in the midst of their troubles, sent St. Ninian to preach the Gospel to the Picts, then inhabiting the southern parts of Scotland.[f] It is quite as indisputable, that Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, was a Briton, and not an

c It had three provinces (York, London, and Caerleon) represented by their Metropolitans.—*Tuttam's Defence of the Ch. of England*, p. 69. There were fifteen Archbishops of London, "before the irruption of the Saxons."—*T. Ridley's View of the Civile and Ecclesiasticale Law.* London, 1634. 2d edition, p. 142.

d Inett's Origines, new edit., i. 21, note. Hales's Ch. of the British Isles, p. 109. Britons and Saxons not Converted to Popery, p. 286. Collier's Ecc. Hist., 8vo. edit., i. 65, etc. Thackeray's Researches, i. 296. Selden says, it is "veri perquam simillimum" that Britain was represented at the Council.—*Opera*, vol. iii., col. 502.

e In A. D. 361, the British bishops refused Constantius's offers of support, just as they had done *before*.—*Hales's Ch.*, etc., p. 109. The British Church had no less than eleven synods before Augustine's times.—*Joyce's British Synods*, p. 109. The independence of the Church is very strongly stated by Archdeacon Williams. "The king, under the ancient system, could alter nothing which respected learning and religion, of his own arbitrary will."—*Antiquities of the Cymry*, p. 177.

f Churton, p. 18, for both.

Irishman[g]—nay, that he called himself a Briton—and that he was sent into Ireland by the British Church, at about the time when Ninian was sent to Scotland. So that both Scotland and Ireland may alike be indebted to Britain for their religion, at a period when Rome knew her not, and she knew not Rome.

All of which goes unitedly and impressively to show, that the Church of England was not merely a Church established, in the very earliest centuries of the Christian dispensation, but a Church in communion with, and well known by, the whole of Christendom—consulted, too, by all Christendom—and its action known, and respected, and sought after, with a world-wide deference, long, long (in fact, hundreds of years) before that period, when Rome's direct interference in English affairs becomes notorious and acknowledged. How completely impertinent, not to say ridiculous, does it then seem, for an intelligent student of history to ignore such a Church—to imagine it un-

g St. Patrick, in Knight's Encyc. Biog., *a Briton.* "He was a North Briton by birth, born A. D., 372, near the village of Banaven, in Tabernia, a district bordering on the Western, or Irish sea."—*Hales's Ch. of the British Isles*, p. 141. It was under his father's own roof, that he first conceived the project of his Irish mission.—*Hales's*, etc., p. 147. He preached the Gospel in Cornwall and Wales, *before* he did so in Ireland.—*Thackeray's Researches*, ii. 167. A chapel was dedicated to him, near the spot where he left Wales for Ireland. And, in Wales, the primitive practice prevails of naming a church not after a *patron saint*, but after its *founder*. It follows, that Patrick was the founder of this church.—*Rees's Essay on the Welsh Saints.* London, 1836. pp. 11, 128, 129. *Williams's Antiquities of the Cymry*, p. 182, and notes. It is quite possible, that Patrick had determined to make Wales his permanent abode. "Then Patrick came to the valley of Rosina, called Glyn Rosyn, and intended to pass his life there."—*Rees's Lives of the Cambro-British Saints.* Llandovery, 1853. p. 403.

organized, unpublished, almost in fact unexisting, simply because the Church of Rome either did not know, or did not care to know, any thing of its fortunes—a want of knowledge (as the sequel will show) to be attributed to the characteristic fact, that it could not render this Church subservient to its own special, individual interests.[h] Rome (as we shall soon ascertain) could readily find England out, when, its Christian establishment having become weakened, a better opportunity offered to thrust upon it her own peculiarities. Then Rome at length attempted to construct upon British territory a Church and a religion after the counsel of her own imperious will, and the pattern of her own selfish heart.

The formal entrance made by Rome into England did not take place till nearly six centuries had passed away, and when England had been known at Rome, politically, from the days of Julius Cæsar, i. e., before the Christian era.[i] If, during this protracted period, Christianity had been wanted in Britain at Rome's hands; or if, having become known there, it was wanted in greater purity, or by way of revival, or reanimation, one would suppose that a *little* something short of six plump centuries might be sufficient to

h Says the antagonist of Dr. Tattam, "*All history proclaims* it was a Roman Missionary, St. Augustine, who converted England to Christianity." This is the way in which Roman writers sometimes endeavor to bluff one off, in the Capt. Bobadil style. They would fain persuade us, that such a thing as Christianity itself was not known in England, till Augustine put Roman feet upon the soil, and opened there his Italian budget.

i Cæsar invaded Britain 55 years before Christ.—Giles's Ancient Britons, ch. ii.

awaken Rome's interest in one of the destitute and suffering provinces of its wonderfully compacted empire. Rome (if the *spirit* of Peter and Paul, and not the overstretched *authority* of Peter and Paul, had been in her) ought to have had ample footing in England before the first century had completed its cycle, and carried its report to judgment. The myrmidons of Cæsar and his successors had opened a Roman highway, for her easy admission. But no; Rome (as we have seen) could not Christianize even her near neighbor, France. Asiatics had to furnish bishops, and martyr bishops too, for Gallia's ancient religious capital. Rome could not send her bishop to the Council of Arles, or to the Council of Nice; though he lived twenty-one years after the first, and eleven years after the second, of these most important assemblies.[j] She could not assist Britain to heave off the incubus of Arianism and Pelagianism—heresies which, when dominant, will reduce Christianity to a mere moral philosophy, or a fanciful speculation. But when her own peculiar imprimatur could be put upon England—her own image and superscription stamped, so to say, on England's physiognomy—*then*, Rome was ready, alert, with all sorts of instrumentalities, to accomplish her apparently honest, but (as ever) her ulterior, selfish, and interested aims.[k]

j Sylvester was Pope from 314 to 336. He was chosen the last of January, 314, and died December 31, 335. The Council of Arles, in France, met in August, 314, and the Council of Nice, in Bythinia, (according to Tillemont,) on the 19th of June, 325. The Council of Arles was intended to be general for, at least, all the West.

k This language will, of course, be considered illiberal. But how

This brings us to the period upon which Rome pitched for making (one may not illiberally say) a religious descent upon English soil. The period was no doubt a singularly propitious one. After the extirpation of Arianism and Pelagianism from England, and when the English Church had a fair prospect for a season of rest, and quiet, solid increase, Britain was most unfortunately cursed with internal troubles, of a purely political complexion.[l] Her petty kingdoms were involved in civil wars, and the King of South Britain, like the Israelites, when beleaguered by the Syrians, resolved in a luckless hour, to go, (as a Jewish prophet would have described it,) to go down for aid into Egypt—i. e., to call in the aid of neighbors, who were pagans and idolaters.[m] This British king invited the wild and godless Saxons of the continent, to de-

much does it differ from Dr. Barrow's, whose treatise on the Supremacy C. Butler, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, quotes in his Book of the Roman Catholic Church, as a model, for its gentlemanly bearing, as well as its scholarly learning. "Such was the humor of that See [the Roman] to allow nothing which did not suit with the interests of its ambition."—*Barrow on the Supremacy*, vol. vii. p. 351, of his works, Hughes's edition. After this Romish sanction of Dr. Barrow, by one English lawyer, I may surely say, in the language of another English lawyer, "Gregory would probably never have planned, nor Augustine travelled, had conversion been the *only* object at which they aimed." (The italicised word is my author's.) —*Muscutt on the History of Church Laws in England.* London, 1851, p. 5. I cannot think it illiberal to do no more than reiterate what such authors have said, and what Bp. Gregoire said, as he was winding up his history of the Confessors of Monarchs. "The Popes have neglected nothing, to obtain and preserve *their* ascendancy over Catholic governments."—*Hist., etc.* Paris, 1824, p. 417. Or what Abp. De Pradt said of the Jesuits, that their scheme was to obtain empire by means of religion.—*De Pradt's Jesuitism*, 10th ed. ch. xv. The objection to Gregoire and De Pradt will no doubt be, that they are a sort of state's-evidence. No question they are; and such evidence is often all we can get against rogues.

l Bede, bk i. ch. 22.

m Giles's Gildas, § 23, Hist.

fend him against the encroachments of his neighbors. Perhaps he was financially unable to subsidize French soldiery, and so applied for those who might be had at a lower price.[n] If so, he discovered to his sorrow, what many another bargainer has done, that the cheapest article at first, proves full often, the dearest in the end. The Saxons came; but, alas, their uncostly alliance terminated but too speedily in the most taxing and rasping of disasters. From allies they were soon converted into aliens, who flew with the appetites of harpies upon the fair possessions of the British, and, like parasites, fed upon the tree that bore them. The melancholy issue was, that Christian Britain, having sought help from the godless, instead of God himself, was forsaken of her Divine Patron, (as the Jews of old full often were,) and given up as a prey to those whom she should never have made friends of. A quaint historian compares her resort to such questionable auxiliaries, to the practice of physicians in ancient days, who poured liquid quicksilver down a patient's throat, till the mineral itself destroyed him. The Saxons, said he, corroded the bowels of the state that entertained them.[o]

Yet, let us sedulously remember, that this remark applies not to Britain universally, but only to its eastern portion, along the German Ocean.[p] The Saxons landed on the isle of Thanet, at the mouth of the

n All the Saxons got was food and clothing.—Turner's Ang. Saxons, Baudry's ed. i. 151. Turner quotes Gildas, § 13, and Nennius, § 28, 35. In Giles's Gildas it is § 23, and in his Nennius, § 36.

o Fuller, i. 92.

p "In that part, however, which was possessed by the Britons, the

river Thames—occupying subsequently, the territory now styled after them, Essex, or the land of the East Saxons; Sussex, or the land of the South Saxons; and Middlesex, or the land of the Middle Saxons. They never vanquished the western portion of the Island of Great Britain, now known as the principality of Wales; where that old tongue, curiously resembling the Hebrew, is still spoken, and which a competent judge pronounces, at once, full, stately, and masculine, and free from that effeminacy of later tongues, out of which, as he says, the bones have been taken, in order to make them bend to modern expediencies.[q] The Saxons never conquered Wales, and Wales still preserves a species of independency; since, a traveller once informed me, the Welsh have been known to refuse sturdily to speak English, because the language of the old inveterate enemies of their fatherland.[r]

In Wales, the ancient Britons found a safe and impregnable retreat; so that when Rome at last set her foot (her foot ecclesiastical) on English territory, "the poor Christian Britons," in the language of the historian Fuller, "living peaceably at home, there enjoyed

Christian faith yet flourished."—*Roger of Wendover*, Bohn's ed. i. 56. "When Augustine came, he found in their province seven bishoprics and an archbishopric, all filled with most devout prelates, and a great number of abbeys; by which the flock of Christ was still kept in good order."—*Six Chronicles*, Geoffrey of Monmouth, bk xi. ch. 12, Bohn's ed. p. 275.

q Fuller, i. 162, 163.—"The English that is now spoken was once as foreign to our country as it is at present to the East Indies."—*Latham on the English Language*, pt i. ch. i.

r Roger of Wendover, who died in 1237, speaks in strong terms of the dislike of the Welsh, as lasting to his times.—Vol. i. p. 52, Bohn's ed. The old British or Lleogrian tongue was a living dialect till half a century ago. The old Celtic tongue is still spoken in the Isle of Man.—*Luppenberg's Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. i. p. 37.

God, the Gospel, and their mountains."[s] There, sheltered behind the massive ramparts of nature, Saxon invasion and Roman innovation could not reach them. And so devoted were they to the faith which they brought with them, and which has ever encouraged and fostered sound learning and virtuous education, that they not only founded bishoprics, but an ecclesiastical province—created a metropolitan, and made this metropolitan's residence the location for a university. And in that now undreamed-of seat of primitive British literature and science, as far back as about the year 500, there were (to say nothing of other pursuits) some two hundred, pursuing the study of astronomy alone.[t]

Surely, such a country must have sought "the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," with no common ardor; and, if Divine promises are infinitely surer than heathen oracles, with no insignificant success. Such a country was not one to be regarded and treated, by believing men, as a de-Christianized one, and still less as an anti-Christian one. Oh no, by the sanctities of the Gospel, no; by the long-suffering of Christian charity, never. Yet

s Fuller, i. 144.

t Fuller, i. 113, 114.—Abp. Usher's chapter sixth of his Religion of the Ancient Irish; in which he shows that the monasteries of primitive times were what we should now call religious colleges—self-supporting ones, too, whose inmates did not demean themselves, like the "new generation of men, that refuse to eat their own bread, and count it a high point of sanctity, to live by begging of other men's bread."—*Answer to a Jesuit, etc.*, new ed. Cambridge, 1835, pp. 567, 570. Archdeacon Williams's *Antiquities of the Cymry*, chaps. xii. and xiii.—*Rees's Essay on the Welsh Saints*, chaps. i. and ii.—*Bp. Lloyd's Historical Account*, p. 160, etc.

upon Popish theories of the introduction of Christianity into England, we are expected to believe, that, when the emissaries of Rome brought Christianity into Kent, as the sixth century was counting its last sands, it was as much of a novelty, and an exotic there, as it would now be, if carried into those barbarous regions of North Africa, where once flourished the dioceses of Cyprian and Augustine, and where they travelled confirming and ordaining, but where a Christian would now be accounted a dog. Why, you can witness for yourselves that Christianity in Wales was, at the time alluded to, such a fully organized and symmetrical commonwealth, that it enjoyed a complete provincial hierarchy, with suffragans, with a metropolitan head, and a college for the education of its clergy, and scientific men at large. The seat of this metropolitan is well-known, and well identified, at even this distant day. It is still an episcopal residence, and formally a bishop's see. It has only lost its archiepiscopal dignity; but it still rejoices in the name of St. David, who lived thirteen hundred years ago.[u] It still boasts of memorials, which can carry

u The original seat of the archiepiscopate of Wales was at Caerleon, upon the Usk. This was on the eastern or exposed side of the kingdom, or principality, and was removed to St. David's, for safety's sake, in troublous times. But the *name* of the arch-see remained for a long period.—Compare *Williams's Antiquities of the Cymry*, p. 144, note. It was so called in the speech of the Welsh bishops to Augustine, which will come up by-and-by. This has been made an objection to the authenticity of that speech; but did the Popes cease to be *Bishops of Rome*, because they resided, for the better part of a whole century, at Avignon in France? A Romanist should beware of such objections: they cut two ways. "Ubi Papa, ibi Roma," is the maxim of Italian Christianity.—*Mathias's Pursuits of Literature*, twelfth edition, p. 335. It is a proverb, in Italy, even in the vernacular.—Bohn's Polyglot of

back one's recollections to times when, not the Holy Catholic Church of the creed of the apostles—not the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the creed of the Fathers of Nice—but the (so called) Holy Roman Church, of the creed of Pope Pius the Fourth—was as utterly unknown there as it now is in the centre of Siberia. You will see, I trust, in the next lecture, ample authority for believing, that the ancient Britons, even when driven back from eastern England before the rough tide—the troublesome waves—of Saxon invasion, were nevertheless excellent Catholic Christians, if rather poor *Roman* Catholic Christians, and were familiar with the creeds in our Prayer Book, if not with that papal creed just now referred to, which dates only from 1564,[v] and is just as old—just precisely as old—as that modern Romanism which Pope Pius IV.'s successors call upon us to welcome and avow, on pain of immortal perdition.

And, I may add, in bringing the present lecture to a conclusion, that Christianity, and Christianity of a truly catholic stamp (of the ancient, and not the modern catholic stamp of 1564, the real birth-time of the *present* Church of Rome)[w] existed, at the times

Foreign Proverbs, p. 94. Compare Gibbon's Dec. and Fall, ch. xv. note, 19, or vol. ii. p. 275.

v Ch. Butler, Esq. on Creeds, pp. 11, 12; or Works, vol. iv.

w "A question may be asked," says old Ephraim Pagitt in his Heresiography, "why I rank the Papists among the late heretics? To which I answer, that there is a great difference between the ancient Papists and the modern, since their Trent Conventicle; and therefore, I rank them with the former sectaries, their doctrines being many of them new."—*Heresiography*, fifth edition, 1654, p. 129. Compare Perceval's Roman Schism, *passim*. Let us hear Mr. Newman, himself, about Roman novelties. A stronger case could not be selected than that of the supre-

on which I have been making comments, in the County of Cornwall, England's south-west extremity, jutting out between the openings of the British Channel and the Channel of Bristol. The Cornish and the Welsh were neighbors in temper, as well as geography. Cornwall, for a long time, resisted the dominion of the Saxons, and withstood the usurpations of Popery down to the tenth century, when the supremacy of the Pope, in Western Europe, had become almost universal.[x] I say *Western*, because in *Eastern* Europe it has never found countenance; though the Pope indulged in bright hopes, during the late war with Russia, and no one rejoiced less than he did in the peace which restored to the palladium of the Greek Church its balance of power.[y]

macy of the Pope. He held this language about its *antiquity*, in his Lectures on Romanism and Popular Protestantism:—the second edition, too; and, of course, his most solemnly reiterated thoughts! "But what there is not the shadow of a reason for saying that they [the Fathers] held, what has not the faintest pretensions of being a catholic truth, is this: that St. Peter, or his successors, are universal bishops, etc.," p. 221. What once had not a shadow of a reason in its behalf—not the faintest pretensions to a reality, to Mr. Newman's natural eyesight, now, with a pair of Romish spectacles on, he sees transubstantiated into a Colossus! No wonder he believes in developments.

x Collins's Perranzabulœ, fourth edition, 1839, pp. 18, 19.

y During the late war in the Crimea, an English correspondent in England informed me that Romanists in England absolutely chuckled over the French alliance, and the battles which Britons had to fight, in connexion with the adherents of Rome, against the Pope's ancient enemies, the Greeks. They esteemed England as led blind-fold, to do the Pope's behests—absolutely hoodwinked, to drag through bloody work for him! And all this, as judicial blindness and servitude, on the part of England, for its infidelity to the Popedom for three hundred years! "Ever since the separation of the Churches," is Mr. Butler's remarkable testimony, "each of the two prelates, the Bishop of Rome, and the patriarch of Constantinople, has been the centre of different systems."—*C. Butler, Esq., on Creeds;* Works, second edition, vol. iv. p. 24. They who

I was saying that ancient Cornwall was no lackey of the Popedom. This is a picture of it, from the pen of Abp. Usher, one of the profoundest of antiquaries, and sincerest of Christians. "Though the Saxon bishops pretended a right to direct and rule the Cornish, in matters of religion; yet, in reality, the Cornish were as averse to receive orders from them, as from the Saxon princes—with whom, being almost constantly at war, they surrendered neither their civil nor religious rights, (continuing Christians, but on the *first plan*, independent though persecuted,) and, esteeming the religion of the Saxons as nothing, the Cornish would no more communicate with them, than with Pagans—accounting that of the Welsh and themselves, the only true Christianity."[z]

A wonderful and transubstantial proof of this was disclosed to modern eyes, when, in 1835, an ancient Cornish church was dug from the sands of Perranzabulœ. This place lies on the Bristol Channel, nearly in a north line from the City of Falmouth, which is situated on the south coast of England, in the 5th degree of west longitude. Its name signifies Peiran, i. e., the seat of St. Peiran, in săbŭlo—*sabulum* being a Latin term for gravel, ground to fine sand, till it can be drifted by the wind, like that on the surfaces of orien-

inconsiderately suppose the Greek and Latin Church pretty much the same thing, would do well to ponder this suffrage of an uncommonly well-informed Romish layman.

z Quoted in Collins's Perranzabulœ; or, The Lost Church Found. London, 1839, 4th ed. p. 18.—For reasons unnecessary to state, I cannot quote *Usher's Britan. Eccl. Primord.*, or *Stillingfleet's Origines Britannicæ*, as I should like to do; or a second volume on Perranzabulœ, by the Rev. William Haslam, Incumbent of Baldiu, near Truro, Cornwall.

tal deserts. St. Peiran is the patron and missionary saint of Cornwall, as St. David is of Wales, and St. Patrick of Ireland. He was born in A. D. 352, and converted all Cornwall, about the year 400, when he was in the prime and vigor of his days. Perranzabulœ was the seat of his Parish or home church; and was, of course, his domestic residence. There he finished his days, and there his bones lie slumbering for the morning of the resurrection. The church which covered them, after having been buried in sand-drifts, for possibly a 1000 years and more, was, in 1835, unearthed to human view; and *then* a church of times indisputably catholic was exhibited to curious eyes. But, alas! for Popery, it was a church whose severe Christian simplicity no devotee of Vatican Christianity could ever tolerate. It had unmistakable signs of exemption from "the modern accompaniments of a *Roman* Catholic place of worship. Here was no rood-loft for the hanging up of the host, nor the vain display of fabricated relics—no latticed confessional—no sacring bell—no daubed and decorated images of the Virgin Mary, or of saints, to sanction the idolatrous transgression of the second commandment. Here was found nothing that indicated the unscriptural adoration of the wafer, or the no less unscriptural masses for the dead. The most diligent search was made for beads and rosaries, pyxes and agnus dei's, censers and crucifixes[a]—not one—not the rem-

a Crosses (simple crosses, not crucifixes,) were found sometimes among ancient British relics; but, unfortunately for Romanism, they were *Greek* crosses, showing the connection of Britain with the East.—

nant of one, could be discovered. Strange, that this ancient church should so belie the Papist's constant appeal to antiquity—to the faith of their forefathers—to the old religion! Strange, that it should, on the contrary, so closely harmonize with that [so called] *novelty*, which Cranmer and the Reformers introduced into the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England!"[b]

With such a picture of genuine, primitive Christianity, identified and delineated to his actual eyesight, a witness who saw it, was surely authorized to exclaim, "it illustrates, in a manner most literally and strikingly true, the actual condition of the long lost Church of England, at the time of the Reformation, when it was not *rebuilt*, but *restored*, *purged*, and *cleansed* from those monstrous errors and incrustations which the Church of Rome, the great Western tyrant, had spread over the walls of our Zion, and, by her repeated encroachments, had at last entombed in the very dust and depths of her own abominations."[c]

Yes, Brethren, old and old-fashioned Christianity in England, was once like the church of St. Peiran in the sands. At the Reformation it was simply disencumbered from the rubbish with which Romanism had overlaid it; and to call the present form of it, in the Church of England, a novelty or an imposition,

Chronicles of the Ancient British Church, 2d ed. p. 135. A small *Greek* cross was found on St. Cuthbert's breast, when his coffin was opened in 1827. The Dean and Chapter of Durham now possess it.—*Chronicles*, etc., p. 138, note. Cuthbert died at Lindisfarne, A. D. 686.

b Perranzabulœ, by Collins, pp. 27, 28.

c Perranzabulœ, p. 30.

would be like calling Lazarus a novelty or an imposition, when he left his rags and his sores behind him, and entering Paradise with the radiant habiliments of an angel, cast himself upon Abraham's bosom.[d]

d Comp. Jewel's Apology, pt 5, ch. 15, div. 4; Works, Parker ed. iii. 92. Bp. Jewel compares England's rescue to that of the three children from the furnace, and of Daniel from the lions' den.

LECTURE III.

THE ITALIAN MISSION OF GREGORY THE FIRST TO EAST ENGLAND, AT THE CLOSE OF THE SIXTH CENTURY.—ITS MOTIVES AND EARLIER FORTUNES.

In two lectures I have endeavored to give a rapid sketch of the introduction of Christianity into Britain, and its progress there for about six centuries. My object has been to show, that Christianity in Britain is quite as old as Christianity in Rome—indeed, I may now add, on the highest Papal authority, Cardinal Baronius himself—older than Christianity in Rome[a]—and that it was, in all human probability,

a "The Greeks, of whom they [i. e., the Romans] received the gospel, of whom they received the faith, the true religion, and the Church."—*Jewel's Works*, Parker edition, iii. 92.—*Fullwood's Roma Ruit*, p. 30, note. Bishop Andrews maintained this in his controversy with Bellarmine.—*Responsio*, p. 40, edit. 1851. "If the case be rightly stated, the Church of England's faith is the old religion, and not that of Rome."—*Comber's Advice to Roman Catholics*, p. 9, fourth edition. Dr. J. H. Newman understood this well, when, in his better and more trustworthy days, he spoke of "a theology, Catholic, but not Roman;" and showed, most ably, how a man might be "Catholic, and Apostolic, yet not Roman." See pp. 24, 25, of his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, second edition, 1838. Dr. Newman may *retract* that book: he cannot *answer* it. He had better have done as Grabe the Prussian did, and whom he commends pp. 25, 26, than as he himself actually did, for his reputation's sake, as well as for his soul's sake.

introduced to Britain as it was to Rome, by Christians from the East. One thing seems triumphantly certain, that early Christianity in Britain has no thanks to bestow on Rome; and owes Rome not so much of tribute as the little coin paid by our Saviour out of the fish's mouth, to the representative of Tiberius Cæsar. So it is no great effort to say, with all confidence, what Blackstone in his Commentaries has ruled as historic law, "The ancient British Church, by whomsoever planted, was a stranger to the Bishop of Rome, and all his pretended authority.[b]

Nevertheless, it is no doubt a fact that Romish divines, historians, critics, and controvertists, have maintained, full strenuously, that *their* form of Christianity was the only one Britannia primitively knew,[c] and that *their* ecclesiastical foothold is, in consequence, the only legitimate one in our father-land. And they have maintained this, the more strenuously, perhaps, in proportion to the weakness of the evidence which has supported their grasping claims. This is what we might expect. We all know, that a lawyer at the bar, and debaters in the forum, are apt to make up in personal vaporing and vehemence, for any deficiency in solid facts. The most famous of modern advocates for the Popedom[d] is never so clamorously dogmatic as

b Blackstone's Com. bk iv. ch. 8.—The word *all* is not always quoted in this sentence. I looked at Blackstone, under the eye of a learned lawyer, and he told me I might rely upon the text, as I have quoted it. The word *all*, coming from Judge Blackstone, is exceedingly emphatic.

c "That vulgar error so often repeated, so sedulously propagated, and so widely believed, that the Britons were not Christians before the arrival of that missionary," i. e., Augustine.—*Joyce's Brit. Synods*, p. 125.

d Count Joseph De Maistre, in his volume *Du Pape*.

when he affirms *that*, which is a favorite point with Romish doctors, but is not to be found among Rome's formal decrees (the Pope's infallibility);[e]—never so bitter or sneering, as when he alludes to the two strongest competitors against papal arrogance—the Greek Church, and the Church of England.

Having reviewed six centuries, and discovered no traces of Roman Churchmanship in Britain, we do at length reach a period when (as there is no doubt) Rome and Great Britain came into formal ecclesiastical contact; and this is that juncture in history which—as was remarked to you in the last lecture would form the starting-point of the present.

The Saxons, who obtained their first permanent residence in England about the middle of the fifth century, were pagans and idolaters.[f] Christianity declined in their presence, was maltreated and oppressed, till many of its disciples and clergy sought refuge in Cornwall, Cumberland, and Wales;[g] while not a few crossed the British Channel, and obtained

e For the non-assertion of the Pope's infallibility, see *Seymour's Mornings with the Jesuits*, ch. 7, p. 220, English edition.—*Waddington's Ch. History*, ch. 28, p. 674, English edition. Delahogue maintains that it is not a mark of error or schism, to deny the Pope's infallibility, even when he speaks ex cathedrâ.—*Tractatus de Ecclesia*, Dublin, 1809, p. 376. Delahogue even maintains, as he justly may, that the Council of Trent has not dogmatized about papal infallibility.—p. 379. Andrew Duval, the great Ultramontane, admitted that it was not an article of the faith.—*Bossuet's Defensio*, vol. i. p. 17. Prof. Klee, of modern celebrity, admits the same.—*Klee's Treatise on the Church*, London, 1847, p. 190.

f The Heptarchy, in (say) from 455 to 585. The Heptarchy, however, is "a phrase not very correctly applied to any one particular period."—*Eccleston's English Antiquities*, p. 28.

g "Wales, Cornwall, and Cumberland, were the only places where Christianity did not lose ground."—*Muscutt on Church Laws*, p. 5.

an asylum in a portion of France, styled, from their occupation of it, Brittany, or Little Britain. It was in Brittany that Gildas, the old British historian whom I have more than once mentioned, composed the work to which commentators on early English history perpetually appeal.[h]

This was about A. D. 564; and the first direct connection of Rome with East England was in 596 or 597,—two or three and thirty years later. In *East* England, I say; for in *West* England, and its vicinity, the Saxons were still kept at bay by the sturdy Cornish, the supple valley-men,[i] and the indomitable mountaineers of the old Cambrian principality. In Ireland, and in Scotland, too, there were numerous Christians who knew little of, and cared less for, Rome and its peculiarities, and sympathized cordially with the Welsh and with the Cornish. These are indelible facts, which you should never forget; since it was not until Rome had vanquished Eastern England, and long after that period, that she could do any thing by way of humiliating the primitive proprietors of British soil, and the early representatives of British Christianity. Truth to say, the old time-honored British spirit has always been an impracticable subject for Rome's manipulation;[j] and this spirit simply

h Collier's Ecc. Hist. i. 144. He wrote his Epistle in Brittany, and his History in Glastonbury, after his return.—Rees's Welsh Saints, p. 226.

i The Valley-men means the inhabitants of Cumberland, which was so called from its mountainous surface, diversified with most beautiful vales and lakes. It is in Cumberland that Derwent-water, Ulles-water, etc., are found. *Comb* was the Anglo-Saxon for valley.—See *Wright's Provincial Dictionary*, Bohn's edition, i. 331; *Halliwell's Dict.* i. 264.

j Speaking of the primitive British Church, Archdeacon Williams

revived, and broke out afresh, when, in the sixteenth century, the yoke of Rome was indignantly thrown from Britain's neck, never, as we trust in heaven, to be imposed upon it again.

The first direct official connexion between England and Rome began (as was said) in the year 596 or 597. This was during the pontificate of Gregory the Great, so called; and who, from some singular mixtures in his character and history, has also been called the last of Rome's good bishops, and the first of its bad ones[k]—the last, too, of saints among the popes, as even Mr. Gibbon fancied. But he was mistaken—there is certainly *one* later; the Pope, who *indulged* his communion in such exquisite and plenary satisfaction, when he cursed Queen Elizabeth, and devoted heretical England to calamities and horrors![l] Gregory was

uses this language in his Antiquities of the Cymry, p. 145: "In her low estate, she was enabled successfully to maintain her ancient privileges, in opposition to the encroachments, continually made upon her liberty and independence, by the Italian missionaries."

k Field on the Church, new edition, i. 180; Bishop Andrews's Tortura Toti, new edition, 1851, pp. 492, 493; Sueur, Hist. de l'Eglise et de l'Empire, vol. v. 269. "With all his humility, he was a most zealous asserter of the power and prerogatives which his predecessors had exercised, or at any time claimed."—Rose's Biog. Dict. viii. 103. The authors of the Universal History depict him with the acuteness and keenness of true scholars, when they say, that if we knew the tyrant Phocas, only through the letters of Gregory, "we should rank him among the best princes mentioned in history."—Vol. xvii. p. 13.

l Bower's Popes, ii. 541. Comp. Gibbon's Dec. and Fall, ch. 45; or vol. viii. 174. No small praise to Mr. Bower, to be more accurate than Gibbon! However, this matter of saintship is sometimes a matter of considerable dispute. Thus, Baronius denies that Eusebius, the Church historian, has been accounted a saint in the martyrologies, and Du Pin contradicts him flatly.—*Du Pin, Hist. Ecc. Writers*, Dublin ed. i. pp. 157, 158. While alluding to Queen Elizabeth, I may as well add, that though many Protestants called her a half-papist, Pius V., in his damnatory

patriarch of Rome from 590 to 604; and as it will be hardly possible to comprehend why he took such profound interest in the extension of his Church (for, as you will see, it was *his own* Church, rather than Christianity, which he desired to establish and perpetuate) in the island of Great Britain, without knowing something of his previous history, and the position of his see among its great sister sees in Christendom, I must pause a little in my sketches, to give you a distinct understanding of these preliminaries.

You have been told, that the Primitive Church was divided into five chief provinces, principalities, or patriarchates, viz.: those of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; which are named to you in their ancient seniority of order—though all equal in rank and independency, all supreme for concerns within their own jurisdiction—a General Council being the final court of appeal when a subject of universal interest (one which affected the Church Catholic) was to be investigated, and determined with general authority.[m] But to go back to the very earliest

Bull, accused her of Calvinism.—*Barlow's Brutum Fulmen*, p. 3. Cerri, Secretary to the Propaganda, calls her "a violent Calvinist."—*U. Cerri's State of the R. C. Religion*, p. 7. De Maistre calls the Russians Calvinists!—*On the Pope*, bk iv. ch. i. p. 302. If any reader wonders at my use of the word "damnatory," let him know, that Pius gives his Bull two titles: "The damnation and excommunication of Elizabeth." It seems, that *once* the word "Calvinist" was about as hard a term of abuse, for Greek and Anglican, as Rome could find. It is out of date now, when we scarce ever hear even a Presbyterian boasting of his Calvinism!

m Bossuet talks like a most excellent ecclesiastical republican when he comes to the touchy subject of Church power. The Church's source of power, he says, is her own corporate self. "Radix autem libertatis ecclesiasticæ eò maxime constat, quod in ipsa Catholica Ecclesia vigeat suprema illa vis et indeclinabilis, qua ipsa Catholica Ecclesia gubernetur."—*Defensio Cleri Gallicani*, vol. ii. 279. 280. This is most excellent

times, I may say, that three only of these patriarchates were in existence, those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch; and when they were first called up for consideration and adjustment, they were (each and all) treated, *not* as was Episcopacy, or the sacraments, as things of apostolical transmission, *but* merely as matters of ecclesiastical custom.[n] This was in A. D. 325, at the Council of Nice, in Bythinia; and Rome then submitted with such grace as she could muster, or out of sheer necessity; as her bishop was not *then* potential enough to be a successful dissenter. In the year 330, Constantine the Great, transferred the Eastern imperial residence, from Nicomedia in Bythinia, to Byzantium on the Bosphorus, (named Constantinople in honor of himself its patron) erected it into a capital of the em-

American doctrine. It is simply saying *for us*, that the United States is a free government because political power springs from people. I need scarcely add, that it is a part of Gallican doctrine, that the decrees of popes, except as the expositions of the sentiments of a General Council, are good for nothing. The Pope, according to that doctrine—not a bad idea, as a political one merely—was, that the Pope was the grand publisher and guardian of ecclesiastical law. For his *will*, as an autocrat, they entertained no respect whatever. Thus, Cardinal Ailly held, that the plenitude of ecclesiastical power resides inseparably "in universitate ecclesiæ Catholicæ." While James Almain held, that the power of a General Council was greater than that of the Pope, "intensivé, extensivè, et indeviabiliter."—See, for both, *Gersoni Opera*, vol. ii. col. 950, 1072. Antwerp, Du Pin's edit. 1706. Vargas, the great Spanish lawyer and embassador, held that councils had inviolable authority, and did *not* want the Pope's confirmation. He was present at the Council of Trent. —*Mich. Geddes on the C. of Trent*, p. 131 of Vargas's Letters, etc. Comp. p. 56, Introd. Disc. for the French doctrine. See, particularly, a most valuable manual, published by M. Du Pin, in Paris, 1847. Mons. Du Pin is said to be a lineal descendant of the celebrated Church historian, Louis Ellies Du Pin; the correspondent of Abp. Wake, on the subject of Church union, in the years 1717, 1718, as detailed in the appendix of Maclaine's Mosheim. The title of M. Du Pin's book is, *Manuel du Droit Public Ecclesiastique Français*. A duodecimo of 572 pages.

n Sixth canon of Nice. "Let the ancient *customs* prevail."

pire, and himself honored it with the appellation of New Rome. This New Rome was, not long after, elevated ecclesiastically, as much as the emperor had elevated it politically.[o] In the second General Council, which sat at Constantinople in 381, it was advanced from a suffragan episcopate into a patriarchate; and its bishop made the second of all bishops.[p] This single act was sufficiently formidable and ominous to Rome's arrogated priority; but a further development made it ten times more so. The action of the Council was persisted in by one of its successors—the fourth General Council, which sat at Chalcedon, in 451.[q] Leo, the *first*, was then Bishop of Rome—a prelate, who may be styled the father of that papal monarchy,

o Antioch, according to Romanists, was the first see of St. Peter; and of course was, once, the Holy See. But Antioch was put down to the third place in the patriarchates, and finally to the fourth place. And why, then, might not Constantinople be exalted? Baronius, according to Bp. Hacket, justified the early treatment of Antioch, and on the proper ground; how then could he, consistently, quarrel with the elevation of Constantinople? "And in my slender opinion," says the bishop, alluding to the depression of Antioch, "Baronius is never more to be commended, than in rendering the true reason of it. Says he, in giving honorable place to the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, regard was had to follow the steps of the Roman Magistrate, and to settle ecclesiastical precedency just as he did distribute his principal civil dignities."—*Hacket's Century of Sermons*, London, 1675, p. 951. The ancient British Church followed a similar rule. Caerleon and Llandaff disputed about the Welsh primacy; having each, at times, been a metropolis.—*Williams's Antiquities of the Cymry*, p. 178.

p That is, the second in dignity: not that he was in higher than Episcopal orders. It is one of the complaints of the Roman, or Latin Church, against the Greek Church, that it was a tenet of the Greek Church, to consider *all* the apostles of equal authority.—*Canisii Thesaurus Monumentorum Ecclesiasticorum*, vol. iv. p. 54.

q Chalcedon was two miles or more south of the modern Scutari; which is opposite to Constantinople, and a suburb of it.—*Smith's Dict. Anc. Geog.* i. 596, col. b.

which Hildebrand erected into a would-be empire for the terraqueous globe. The Council of Chalcedon affirmed and extended the action of the Council of Constantinople[r]—made the Bishop of Constantinople a patriarch *in form;* and Leo, as we may readily imagine, opposed such action, with all the influence he could concentrate, and all the power he could array.[s] The council heard him by his legates (for he was not personally present;) and though its members were rebuked by those legates, as wretched and worthless Churchmen[t]—as no doubt they were, for the purposes of Rome—they reiterated their action, and set their hands to a procedure, which Rome had finally to succumb to; and which, for all her writhing, remains unaltered to this far distant day.[u] I beg particular

r Canon XXVIIIth. W. A. Hammond on the Councils. Eng. edit., 1843, p. 108, etc. Rome's story about this canon is, that the Emperor Theodosius compelled the Council to pass the canon, without the Pope's knowledge.—*Canisii Thesaurus*, iv. 56.

s So did Gregory I. after him; and tried, in his characteristic way, to provoke the jealousy of the other patriarchs. But Du Pin says, they took it very quietly, and his invidious efforts failed.—*Du Pin's Ecc. Writers.* Dublin ed., i. 569. In A. D. 1215, as Vargas, the great Trentine lawyer, admitted, the Pope had to give in, after more than seven hundred years grumbling. So if Rome takes plenty of time to make up its mind, it ought to give us poor Protestants full leisure, and not be in such a tremendous hurry to get us into Purgatory, or a worse place.

t Allies on Schism, 2d edit., pp. 292, 297.

u Rome tried to accomplish by a trick, what she could not by fair means. She corrupted the next reiteration of Constantinople's superiority, made in the 36th canon of the Council in Trullo, A. D. 692; which is often called the appendix of the Great Council of A. D. 680.—*Bp. Bilson on Christian Subjection*, edit. 1585, part i., pp. 111, 112. This sort of trick is one of Rome's habitual arts. When she cannot evade testimony, she goes strait to corrupting witnesses. See, on Roman Forgeries, Cooke, Crashaw, Traherne, James, Comber, Pope, Gibbings, Mendham, Gibson in his Preservative, and even J. H. Newman, in his second lecture of the memorable work on Romanism and Popular Protestantism. It is most

attention to this most significant fact, for I know of no one like it, to show that the Church Catholic—the true Church Catholic—represented in a catholic council, pays no respect whatever to Rome's fancied supremacy; and, though flouted by Rome's legates, calmly, coolly, with quiet dignity, but unshaken resolution, looks insult full in the face, and re-affirms its positions.[v] Rome never had a more manly, a more Chris-

amusing (if I may turn aside a moment) to find in that book, a condemnation of Rome for admitting developments! "The creed of Romanism is ever subject to increase; ours is fixed once for all!" p. 260.

This subject is so important, that perhaps after general references, I may be pardoned for a few particular ones; as I do not intend these notes for the learned, but for my younger brethren, who may not have access to many books, and may be glad of them. Dr. Field, who is the parallel of Hooker in a different line of controversy, says, "We reverence and honor the Fathers, much more than the Romanists do, who pervert, corrupt, and adulterate their writings, but dare not abide the trial of their doctrines, by the indubitate writings of antiquity."—*Field on the Church*, new ed. vol. i. p. 307. Compare vol. ii. 407, note; and vol. iv. p. 510. In John Rainold's Conference with Hart, the Papist, we meet with this running title, "Counterfeits bearing the name of Fathers," *e. g.*, pp. 417, 433. In Reeves's Apologies, ii. 356, 2d ed., is a very important note on the subject. Heylyn on the Reformation, ii. 283, new ed., shows that Gregory the Great has been tampered with, among the rest. So notorious has the garbling process been, that Zola, a professor at Pavia, during the last century, had to publish a dissertation against systematic fibbing, viz: De vitandâ, in historiâ calamitatum ecclesiæ, dissimulatione." Referred to in Gregoire's *Hist. of Confessors*, Paris, 1824, p. 4. I will only add, as a conclusion, that Mr. Palmer, in his British Episcopacy vindicated against Cardinal Wiseman, detects His Eminence in the habit of his illustrious predccessors. He even shows how Dr. W. can put into the mouth of a General Council what it never uttered! pp. 59, 60. In reference to the fact which began this note, Du Pin admits, that the Patriarchate of Constantinople was acknowledged by the Church Catholic; while Dr. J. M. Neale shows, that, in A. D. 1215, the Pope himself admitted it at last!—*Du Pin, De Antiqua Disciplina*, p. 46; *Neale's Gen. Introduct. Hist. East. Ch.* p. 29. This last momentous fact is also put on record, by Prof. Palma, Pio Nono supervidente!—*Palma's Prælectiones*, 2d ed. Rome, 1848, vol. i. 290. This is the act to which Vargas alluded.—*Geddes on Councils*, p. 131.

v "Notwithstanding his opposition," says Du Pin, "the Bishops de-

tian, or a more solemn rebuke, to her despotic usurpations—unless, perhaps, when Christ himself said to the presumption of the apostle she most honors, 'Get thee behind me, Satan!'

This was not a thing likely to be forgotten,[w] or any the less dreaded, when, in the time of the pope to whom I would now particularly point you, a *third* step was taken, in lifting Constantinople to the pinnacle of ecclesiastical pre-eminence. It was not very long before Gregory's days,[x] that the Bishops of Constantinople began to assume, and be acknowledged by, a title which they still wear—that of ecumenical or universal bishop. This was about the latest of assumptions to be ventured, before Rome herself would be distanced, and brought down from a prior rank, as had been the patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch. Gregory was stirred to the very uttermost, by its shocking premonitions. He argued, he protested,

clared that they would go on; and the [royal] commissioners, without any regard to what was said by the Pope's Legates, said that *all* the Synod had given their approbation to their determination."—*Du Pin's Ecc. Writers*, i. 679. Richer, or Richerius, begins his account of the affair on p. 221, vol. i. of the quarto edition of his history of General Councils, and says, on p. 248, that the sum of the whole matter establishes two points:—one, that a canonical decision of a General Council is binding, in spite of the Pope; which, he adds, has always been the doctrine of the school of Paris: the other, that the Pope's vain endeavor to set aside the canon, is an everlasting vindication of Church freedom, against the power of an ecclesiastical monarchy. The popedom, as Richer very properly understands the matter, makes the Pope, not first among bishops; but, an ecclesiastical emperor. O, si sic omnes Romani!

w Constantinople was hated from this time forward, as "Romanæ ecclesiæ rebellis"—a downright rebel against the Church of Rome!—*Canisii Thesaurus*, vol iv. p. x.; out of Gunther, the Monk's History of Constantinople, written *before* 1215, to wit, in 1210.

x Art de verifier les dates, p. 260. John IV. of Constantinople, A. D. 588.

he frowned, he warned, he scolded, he threatened, he excommunicated, he carried out the tragi-comedy, by playing the part of mock humility, and calling himself the servant of the servants of God—an act of seeming and unexpensive lowliness, which his successors have generally followed.[y] But all his resources failed him—failed him utterly, and to heart-sickness—almost to despair, it may be, and made him a chronic invalid. The Bishop of Constantinople was now his equal in grandeur, as he had long been in authority and jurisdiction. He might soon be his superior; and the degradation of Alexandria and Antioch become his own. Every thing seemed adverse to him, and discouraging to hope. The East was prosperous; but in the West the Roman empire had collapsed, and the Lombards were threatening Italy with devastation. Gregory (as I showed you in my lectures on the Litany) had seen his enemies under Rome's very ramparts, and composed, in view of the irruptions of ruthless invaders, those passionate supplications, among which we find the following, "From our enemies defend us, O Christ; with pity behold the sorrows of our hearts."[z]

What should he do, in such startling, harrowing, excruciating exigencies? He understood, as we are told, the grand European problem of the balance of power; for he had favored Naples on one side of him, as an offset to the Lombards on the other.[a] Should

y Art de verifier des dates, p. 259, generally, *not* always.
z Wheatley on the Com. Prayer, ch. iv. § 4.
a Giannone's Naples, i. 225. London, 1729.

he not then, in consonance with the same policy, embrace any and every opportunity for spreading his own peculiar dominion, as widely as might be in the West, as an offset to the encroachments of his rival in the East? Most assuredly, (any statesman would exclaim,) such would be prudent and sagacious policy; and with every allowance for his sainiship, I cannot refrain from thinking, as I read his chequered story, that if Gregory, for his place, was a pretty fair Christian, he was also, for the same place, a most devoted politician. He had the comprehensive range, and restless eye, and perpetually converging reference to one grand plan, which mark a distinguished politician. And he had the aim, the perpetually sleepless aim, for an illustrious yet selfish end, which marks such a politician. He had the unscrupulous conscience of such a politician; for, says even a Romish author, he could bestow the vilest flattery on a tyrant, a usurper, an assassin, worthy all the inflictions of human justice![b]

b Llorente's Portrait les Papes, i. 166. Comp. Maimbourg, another Romish author, quoted by Bruys, Hist. des Papes, i. 386. Gregory coolly advises Ethelbert to convert his subjects, among other means, by flattery *Blandiendo* is the word he himself uses in his epistle.—*Bede*, bk i. ch. 32. He of course hesitated not to act on his own counsel. In the same way, "he showed extreme complaisance towards Brunehaut, Queen of France, who, according to many historians, was the most abandoned woman upon earth."—*Rose's Biog. Dict.* 8, 104, col. a. Compare *Cave's Historia Literaria*. Oxford, 1740. Vol. i. 544.

That Gibbon should lash Gregory for his conduct towards Phocas, was doubtless to be expected; but he sustains himself with pretty strong facts. In the first place, he shows what a wretch Phocas was in himself—"Ignorant of letters, of laws, and even of arms, he indulged in the supreme rank a more ample privilege of lust and drunkenness; and his brutal pleasures were either injurious to his subjects, or disgraceful to himself." Then he shows, how Chosroes II., the Persian monarch, *an*

And to this man, there now came a message from England, intimating that England was a fit field for the indulgence of his impatient anxieties, about the enlargement and glorification of his ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction. Would he have received such an intimation, with sacred and exclusive reference to the necessities of perishing souls? Or, would he have construed it for the promotion of his own Church interests?

These are the questions, which are to determine the character of Gregory's mission to England, in 596 or 7:—a mission which terminated in the establishment of Romanism among the Saxons; and finally brought all England under a Popish ban, till the Reformation burst its fetters asunder, and she was emancipated and independent.

idolater, "turned with horror from the assassin, imprisoned the pretended envoy, disclaimed the usurper, and declared himself the avenger of his father and benefactor." Then, that the murdered emperor was a man of such matchless integrity, that he would not dissemble to save the life of his own child, when the life of a faithful nurse would be thereby endangered—a falsehood that Jesuitical morality would have glorified, had the child *not* been a heretic—and upon which the sternest moralist would have dropped a tear of pity. Yet, such a man, Gregory, the Great, the Pontifical, the Sainted, could abandon to his fate, to honor not the name only, but the very statue, of his murderer!—*Milman's Gibbon*, ch. 46, vol. viii. pp. 216, 17, 18, 23. And, now, for the motive of such, may I not say, un-Christlike, if not anti-Christian conduct? Mr. Finlay brings it out, in his Greece under the Romans, volume first, of his valuable historical productions. On p. 374, he tells us, that Phocas was an opponent "of the *Greek* party in the Eastern Church." So here comes out the old party predilection and conduct, under the instinct of an old party quarrel. I am surely justified, in view of such glaring facts, in calling Gregory a mere political partizan! And still, as Mr. Finlay tells us, Phocas's column and eulogium exist at Rome; while Bergier, in his Theological Dictionary, informs us, with the brazen audacity of a Jesuit, that Gregory, in his heart, esteemed Phocas a monster, but had to give him a laudatory anodyne to keep him quiet, and prevent him from making trouble in Italy!—*Theol. Dict.* new ed. Paris, 1829, Vol. iii. p. 422.

I speak of a message from England, and I speak thus on the authority of Gregory himself,[c] in some of his own epistles, and discard the story, often told, about his seeing slaves from Britain for sale in the Roman market, and having his attention directed, thereby, to the land from which they came, as a land hitherto unknown.[d] The story is interlarded with flat monkish puns—it reflects no credit upon Gregory's literary attainments, representing him as unacquainted with a country well known at Rome before the Christian era—and it disgraces Rome itself, more than I care to do; since it represents it as unable, after three and sixty popes had labored for its purification, to banish the traffic in human flesh.[e]

c Chronicles Anc. Brit. Ch. p. 151.

d The story comes, of course, from Bede, bk ii. ch. 1; but he gives it as a mere tradition. His Latin word is *dicunt*, they say; and a Protestant story, upon *such* authority, would be condemned at Rome, in double-quick time! Mr. Muscutt, as a lawyer, sees the worth of such *hearsay* testimony, and remarks, "The oft-repeated incident, respecting the Angli sed Angeli, bears, however, so much the appearance of an after adjustment of phrases, as to induce some historians to attach little or no credence to the story."—*Muscutt on Church Laws*, p. 6.

e Gregory was the 63d, the 64th, the 65th, or the 66th Pope. Bower says, the 63d; Llorente, the 64th; Dict. des Papes, the 65th, and Bruys, the 66th. A beautiful specimen of Papal consistency! De Maistre, on the Pope, says, (p. 237, or bk 3, ch. 2,) that the popes "have unceasingly combated" slavery. This slave market of 600 years standing, right under their very eyes, looks like it, with a vengeance! It was under a Protestant government that England herself was declared no place for slavery. "In the eleventh year of Queen Elizabeth, a slave from Russia was brought into England, and, his master insisting upon the power of scourging him, it was held, that England was too pure an air for *a slave to breathe in.*"—*Eunomus*, or, *Dialogues concerning the Law and Constitution of England*, 5th ed. 1822, p. 183, note. "To Wickliff and his followers is to be ascribed the merit of propagating the doctrine, that the Christian Religion is repugnant to slavery."—*Amos's ed. of Fortescue de laudibus legum Angliæ.* Cambridge, Eng. 1825, p. 160.

So Gregory did not contemplate England as a missionary field, till he was prompted to do so; and now comes the profoundly interesting and decisive question, from what quarter did this prompting issue?

Romish historians are, of course, concerned to represent Britain, at the close of the 6th century, as immersed in the deepest midnight of barbarism and ignorance. Their evident object is, to signalize the introduction of Romish light, beneath the sable pall of a heathen canopy. But the simple, unvarnished fact is, that even the chief king of Saxon Britain (and there were seven of them) *at this very time*, had a Christian, and not a Pagan queen.[f] She was the daughter of a French monarch, and had brought with her, to her husband's court, a bishop with his ecclesiastical retinue. She had consented to marry a Saxon sovereign, solely on the condition of the free and unembarrassed exercise of her religion; and her consort had readily assigned her, for her accommodation, one of the oldest British churches. Doubtless, it was not over pleasant to this distinguished religious lady, to forsake a Christian land for an anti-Christian one; and, if any body is to have the honor of being the first and most heroic missionary to the Saxons in England, *to her* does that honor most rightfully belong. Unquestionably, she labored, with all assiduousness, for her pagan spouse and his benighted

f Bede, bk i. ch. 25. Bede expressly says of the Saxon king, "he had *before* heard of the Christian Religion, having a Christian wife," etc. "To this was added the very exemplary life of Bishop Luidhard, who had come over with the queen; by which, though silently, he allured the king to the knowledge of Christ our Lord."—*William of Malmsbury*, Bohn's ed. 1847, p. 12.

subjects.[g] She predisposed and attempered them for the introduction of Christianity, upon a larger scale. She applied for co-operation (it is possible) to the British bishops of Cornwall and Wales—since, both Gildas and Bede accuse them of neglecting the religious welfare of the Saxons. A somewhat hard accusation when one remembers that the Saxons had driven them into virtual exile, and were trying to reduce them and their country to abject vassalage, while their friends and brethren were contending for freedom at all earthly costs.[h] Finding herself cut off

g Mrs. Hall's Queens before the Conquest. Article, Bertha, vol. i. pp. 338–360. "Gregory says, Next to God, England was indebted to *her* for its conversion."—*Carte's England*, vol. i. p. 222.

h Rapin and Carte vindicate the British prelates.—*Rapin*, i. 226.—*Carte's England*, i. 221. The Welsh accounts say, they asked, as a preliminary, that Pope Gregory should persuade the Saxons to surrender the lands, usurped from them. If Augustine could not afford to ask the Saxons to be *just*, ought he to have asked the British to be charitable? For the Welsh view of the matter, see *Williams's Antiquities of the Cymry*, p. 240. It may be our duty to go and preach the Gospel to those who have driven us from our homes, and squatted on our patrimony. But, surely, *they* are not the persons to ask this duty of us, who sustain our persecutors in their usurpations. Mr. Newman's apology for Augustine's and Gregory's refusal to induce the Saxons to restore their plundered inheritance to the Britons, is, that "the Holy See" never commits itself to "a system of gratuitous interference with national arrangements."—*Life of St. Augustine*, p. 229, London, 1845. If this biography was not written by Mr. Newman, he caused it to be written; and I call it *his*, because qui facit per alium, etc. Now, if he supposed such an excuse, as the above could, in the face of all history, be admitted by non-Romanists, he must have been in one of those hallucinations common to him in 1845, and thereabouts, during which he *called* himself a Protestant, and *lived* on Protestant money, but was all the while *in his heart* a devotee of Rome. Under the influence of that hallucination, he must have supposed himself writing horn-books for children, and not grave narrations of fact for sober, grown people. If Mr. Newman had been half as honest as William Ranchin, a Roman Catholic, he would, a thousand times sooner, have written Ranchin's chapter "Of the Complaints and Oppositions which have been made against the Pope's Dominion over Kingdoms

from immediate auxiliaries, and disappointed by her own countrymen, grown more supine, it may be, than their ancestors who were wont, as you have seen, to aid Britain in an extremity, she (as a *last*, and not a *first* thing) acquainted the Bishop of Rome, with her peculiar condition, and asked for assistance, to promote the undertaking, *which she had full favorably begun.* She, and her chaplains, had not force enough to reap the harvest which was evidently approaching, and she asked for fellow-laborers—*that* was the length and breadth of her simple and natural petition. Her letter, representing not the *future*, but the *actual* state of things, viz., "the English nation [*nation*, mark you, and not a few individuals of a nation] is desirous to turn Christian"[i]—her letter reached Gregory, at a juncture, when, as I have shown, he panted asthmatically for the amplification of his see; and, as I too much fear, was hailed by him as an auspicious opening, more than as a call to rugged and revolting duty. The issue verifies my supposition; for when his missionaries halted in South France, and wished to abandon the expedition, he would not listen to their remonstrances. He started them afresh, and roused the sympathies of the French in their behalf, with the subtlety of an Italian politician. He knew that the French were at war with the German Saxons, and

and Empires"—a chapter full of anti-papal matter.—Langbaine's translation of *Ranchin's Review of the Council of Trent*, Oxford, 1638, p. 123. I the more readily quote this book, as it shows what books Oxford encouraged in days when many thought it tending to Popery.

i A quotation no doubt from *her* letter incorporated into Gregory's own.—*Chron. Anc. Br. Ch.* p. 151.—Thierry's Conq. of England, i. 30.

talked to them of the Anglo-Saxons, as if they were substantially the same people, and were to be converted to become French subjects![j] Having, by this famous missionary argument, excited French sympathies, and secured French co-operation, he despatched his (as I may now fairly denominate them) *campaigners*, for a second politico-religious expedition. After their French reinforcement, they succeeded in effecting a landing on British soil, where, as we shall soon see, their grand aim and effort was less to make Catholic Christians, (i. e., Catholic Christians, in the proper sense of that most misappropriated term,) than votaries and emissaries of the see of Rome.[k]

Finis coronat opus, the end is the coronation of the work, says the old adage; and it is a true one, whereby to judge of a series of acts leading to a predetermined issue. For, by the end aimed at, you can

j Thierry's Conquest, i. 29, 30. If Gregory had talked as a *Christian*, and not as a *politician*, he would have reminded the French that they would find in England a queen, a bishop, etc., their own country-people and fellow-Christians.

k Gregory discovered that none but genuine Romans could accomplish his work. He bought young Englishmen, sold for slaves, and tried to make instruments of *them;* but they would not answer. "It would seem," says Thierry, "that these missionaries, on compulsion, did not answer the purpose of their masters; for Pope Gregory, soon laying aside this fantastic expedient, resolved to intrust the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Romans, of tried faith and solid learning."—*History of the Conquest*, i. 29. It is evident, Gregory could find no such supple and reliable auxiliaries as out-and-out Romans. Indeed, Bede himself confesses as much, when, in his "Lives of the Holy Abbots," he incidentally shows how important it was to have a bishop from among those "who had been *adequately* instructed, by the *Roman* disciples of the blessed Pope Gregory, in Kent, on *every* topic of Church discipline."—*Giles's Bede*, vol. iv. p. 363. Incidental testimony is said to be *sometimes* the most valuable of any testimony whatever. Here, according to the old proverb, it lets the cat out of the bag most completely.

appreciate the labors which procured it. If the end of the sainted, rather than the saintly Gregory, had been to make Christians merely, he would have welcomed with gladness any willing collaborators for such an undertaking. But (as you perceive, perhaps, already) he wanted to manufacture *Roman* Christians, above all others. You will soon find that he would endure no others, renounced the communion of all others, and left them the name, and the fate, of perfidious and execrable heretics.[l] He wanted no one to dissent from the supremacy of his jurisdiction in England, any more than he wanted a rival at Constantinople; and his quarrel with some Christians in England being, in its chief point, (that of his own supremacy,) his exact quarrel with Christians in Constantinople, it is but reasonable to presume that he was never forgetful of the pretended honors of his see —never unready to vindicate, and to extend them, "unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills."[m] At least, I prefer to make this explanation of Grego-

l Bede, lib. ii. ch. 2, uses the very words *perfidus*, and *nefandus*, of the ancient orthodox Britons; and pronounces them, in addition, despisers of salvation. Of course, he learned to abuse the ancient Christians of his country in this horrid style, from a Romish school. He does not use worse words, or as hard ones of the British Pelagians; he indeed calls their notions *damnable*, yet does not style them a *heresy*, but only a *perversity*. His Latin is *perversitate damnabili*, book i. ch. 18. Anti-Romanizers, then, are perfidious wretches, who despise salvation; Pelagians are only perverts! This is the doctrine of a Romish nomenclature! J. H. Newman, in his Life of Augustine (p. 333) translates *perfidi* by "traitors to the Church." He little dreamed, it may be, that when he adopted Bede's hatred of the Britons, with his formidable language, he was his own portrait painter!

m "His successful inroads into the provinces of Greece, of Spain, and of Gaul, might countenance the more lofty pretensions of succeeding popes."—*Gibbon*, Milman's ed. ch. 45, vol. viii. 173.

ry's conduct, in most matters, as more creditable to himself than one given by Sabinian, his immediate successor in office, his personal acquaintance, and his most trusted nuncio—his confidential representative, for years, at the place most troublesome to him on earth—Constantinople. Sabinian unblushingly accuses Gregory of being instigated by a mere anxiety for personal popularity, and seems to have found all Rome ready to believe him; for Gregory was scarce cold in his grave, ere the Romans came near consigning his memory to infamy, by attempting to burn in the forum every production of his pen! I honor Gregory, therefore, more than a Pope, more than Rome itself has done;—surely, I cannot be accused of awarding him unwonted censure, or of looking at his case through the spectacles of heretical perverseness.[n]

Well, then, we at last reach the plain conclusion, that invited, possibly importuned, by good Queen Bertha—the wife of the Saxon monarch already alluded to—Gregory the First, anxious to widen his spiritual territory, commissioned Augustine (sometimes called Augustine *the lesser*, to distinguish him

n Platina's Popes, Rycaut's ed. London, 1685, p. 101. Bower's Popes, ii. 543, 44. Fleury hurries over Sabinian's case in as few words as possible; and so does the Dictionnaire des Papes which follows in his wake. Bayle tries to extenuate Platina; but Bruys shows that he is unsuccessful.—*Hist. des Papes*, i. 408. Llorente is severe upon Sabinian; but it behoves the advocates of the Papacy to remember, that if he is just in his criticisms upon Sabinian, he may be equally just in his castigation of Gregory. Palma, in his Prælections, endeavors to show it is impossible that Sabinian hated Gregory, or that he himself wanted virtue. Be it so, learned professor of the Ninth Pius. Then Sabinian's caustic censure of Gregory was merited.—*Palma's Prælections*, i. 431, 32, 2d Roman edition.

from the great doctor, who was Bishop of Hippo) with some thirty companions, to proceed to England in 596 or 7, and do what might be done for the promotion of an enterprise, which, *no doubt*, he had very nearly at heart. With his company, recruited to forty in France, he landed on the Isle of Thanet, at the mouth of the Thames. They were received distrustfully by Ethelbert, the Saxon king; but at the instance, questionless, of his excellent queen, were soon invited to Canterbury, his capital city, and allowed to mingle freely with their fellow-Christians, and countrymen *already there*, and with the people at large. One caution, one memorable caution only, did the Saxon king impose upon them, and, as an observer might say, with a sort of prophetical anticipation of the quality of the individuals with whom he had to deal. He had learned, he said, "from his instructors and leaders to salvation, that the service of Christ ought to be voluntary, not by compulsion." He, therefore, would allow no compulsion of any sort, in the business of Christianizing his realms.[o] Oh, had Rome, had even Augustine implicitly followed this benignant injunction—had not Popery made it afterwards a matter of actual law, "that heretics, however unwilling, are to be brought to salvation by force; that the Church is to persecute them; and that the enemies of the Church are to be coerced by arms;" what a

o Bede, bk i. 26. A papist would say the king got this advice from Augustine. If so (no strange thing) Augustine was a hypocrite, and belied his own counsel. No, by *leaders* he means Bertha, and his first instructors. Gentle Bertha, no doubt, told him so.

different hue had overspread the lengthened annals of Romano-English history![p] And how had many a century been guiltless of testimony against Rome, where now we can trace her characteristic passage, amid excommunications, and anathemas, amid fetters and dungeons, amid stains of blood and the smoke of penal fires!

Of course, when Romish writers detail the advent of Augustine and his associates into Saxon England, it is no part of their plan to let us understand, that England (aye, Saxon England), had already a Christian queen, with a bishop and a staff of clergy for her guardians and instructors, and had regular Christian services amidst, and around, the very court of a Pagan monarch, for at least a quarter of a century.[q] Even Bede himself can afford the noble, self-sacrificing Queen Bertha, but two short sentences in his history, and Dr. Lingard, in his work on the Anglo-Saxons, about as many lines, to show that she had influenced her husband in favor of her own religious opinions. But the moment a *Roman* satellite steps upon English shores, we find *him* heralded by miracles, and conversions by tens of thousands, as though Christianity were as much of a novelty there, as it was to the Indians of New England, two centuries and a half ago! Why, the very rock upon which Augustine first stepped in Thanet, is said to have received the imprint of his feet, as if it had been a cake

p Southey's Vindiciæ, p. 29. Southey, in his notes, quotes the Latin Decretals.

q Bertha was married in 570.

of wax:[r]—a prodigy which we might have been induced to accredit, had he only been but a Puritan pilgrim, and stepped upon the rock of Plymouth! The bishop already on English soil—the very queen who was unquestionably *the* instrument of gaining an access for more distant adventurers in the work of Saxon conversions—*such* persons, and their fellow-laborers, are quietly thrust aside—while (marvellous to behold!) the curtain rises, a few play-actors from Rome enter upon the scene—and, at once, like the he-goat in the prophet's vision, they fill "the face of the whole earth," and there is not a corner for history's fame but it must be filled by them! Well does honest and quaint, but, as Mr. Southey calls him, delightful old Fuller say, "Thus was *Kent* converted to Christianity. For such as account this a conversion of all England, to make their words good, do make use of a long and strong synechdoche, a part for the whole: far more than half of the land lying, some years after, in the darkness of paganism; which others [*others*, mark you, not Augustine and his corps] afterward enlightened with the beams of the Gospel."

St. Paul was the principal founder of the Church of Corinth, and took so deep an interest in its welfare, as to write it two long epistles. Nevertheless, he could say to his Corinthian converts, "I will not be burdensome to you; for I seek not yours, but you."[t] But Augustine and his retainers had no sooner planted themselves on British territory, than, in the old lan-

[r] Fuller's Ch. Hist. i. 135, 136. [s] Fuller's Ch. Hist. i. 144.
[t] 2 Cor. xii. 14.

guage of the law, they determined to be seized of as much of that valuable commodity as they could get within their clutches. When Augustine had propitiated Ethelbert, *then*, though he saw a bishop by the queen's elbow daily, he determined to undermine him, by becoming not a bishop merely, but a bishop's superior, a metropolitan. He informed Pope Gregory of his success, (without a whisper about Christians already in England, and already provided with a bishop) of his own self-obtained success; and Gregory takes good care that he should enjoy the bishopric, nay, the archbishopric, for which he schemed.[u] He hied him away for consecration, to one whom he could trust implicitly — near himself — in South France. Surely, if Augustine wanted Episcopal ordination merely, he might have had it in Paris, or its neighborhood, if not in Wales. But no, Gregory must be his oracle in every thing. Indeed, the whole story of Romish intervention in England, has ever such a Rome-wise tendency in its reputed facts, that it is as impossible to mistake their dress, as it would be to misjudge the tonsure and garb of a monk, in the neighborhood of the Eternal City.

u Augustine was so grasping he wanted to be a sort of patriarch. Gregory had to rebuke him. "But you, of your own authority, shall not have power to judge the bishops of France."—*Giles's Bede*, vol. ii. 117, in the answer to Augustine's seventh question. Augustine had a ready example before him to imitate, in his master; and he was in danger of being too apt a scholar. Nevertheless, that master was disposed to be reasonably indulgent. He had no more legitimate jurisdiction over the British Episcopate *then*, than his successor has *now;* yet he said with all complaisance, "As for *all* the Bishops of Britain, we commit them to your care."—*Ibid.* Compare *Rees's Essay on the Welsh Saints*, pp. 291, 292.

Augustine, having become fairly inaugurated in England, returns to it, no longer plain Father Augustine, a humble priest, but a most reverend lord high archbishop. In due time he received his official Romish badge, the pall;[v] and was bidden by Gregory to parcel out England,[w] as coolly as Pius IX. lately reparceled it, when he put one of *his own* archbishops cheek by jowl with the Archbishop of Canterbury—a thing, which if England's queen were to parallel in Italy, all the lava of Vesuvius would not be thought too much to pour forth upon her infinite audacity! Bishops, and archbishops, too, had been known, and long known in England; for the three archbishops of Britain, those of London, of York, and of Wales, were the prelates who represented (and properly) the entire British Church, in the great Council of Arles, summoned by Constantine, A. D. 314—i. e., some three whole centuries before. These three were, beyond a doubt, the three natural primitive archbishoprics of Britain;[x] but another spirit had started up, which ignored the history of elder times. In the familiar language of the Scriptures, another king had arisen which knew not Joseph; and Augustine was installed

v The pall, or *pallium*, is a pontifical ornament peculiar to bishops, and marks, ordinarily, the rank of an archbishop. This is Bergier's definition, from which it would seem that the pallium is not *always* the ensign of an archbishop.—*Dictionnaire Theologique*, vol. vi. p. 184. Compare *Chronicles Anc. Brit. Ch.* 2d ed. p. 184; *Carte's England*, i. p. 223.

w Bede, bk i, 27.—Answer to Augustine's 7th question—at the end, Gregory gave Augustine, (I now give the Latin, as the English is in the note preceding,) "Britanniarum *omnes* episcopos"—every soul of them!

x The Welsh Triads put them in this order: Llandaff, York, and London.—*Williams's Antiquities of the Cymry*, p. 203.

Archbishop of Canterbury; which see, from his days downward, has been the seat of the chief ecclesiastical dignitary of British realms. We may regret this, when we know that it is an honor conferred on Canterbury, because *that* was the first English see which paid allegiance to Rome; but we cannot regret it long, when we remember that Rome's first favorite in England is Rome's greatest detestation in all Christendom. Verily, I believe with full confidence, that if Rome had now a choice between the overthrow of Constantinople, one of her oldest enemies, or of Canterbury, one of her later ones, Constantinople, with Roman curses upon her heavy enough to outweigh a mountain, would now go scot free.[y] For now the sun never sets where

[y] Any thing would have been granted to England, if she would have acknowledged the supremacy of Rome. "Pope Pius IV. (*anno* 1560) offered to Queen Elizabeth, to allow our whole Book of Common Prayer, if she would receive it as from him, and by his authority."—*Cade's Justification of the Church of England*, London, 1630, p. 84. A statement reiterated in Gee's edition of Rob. Parson's Jesuit's Memorial, published in London, in 1690, and noticed by Mr. Mendham, in his Literary Policy, pref. to 2d ed. p. xix. For Dr. Gee's statements, see pp. xxi. and xxxix. of his Introduction. Romanists may squib at these as much as they please. The dates of the quotations show what our forefathers believed; and the promise is in perfect keeping with Roman and Jesuitical policy. It would be easy enough, too, to use a bad liturgy with the allowance of the Jesuits. "It seems more probable that no attention at all, neither internal, nor formal, nor virtual, is required in a man's repeating the office."—*Father Pierre Boyer's Parallel between the Jesuits and the Pagans*, trans. by S. Whateley, London, 1738, 2d ed. p. 56. Boyer quotes from a Jesuit's Course of Divinity, and gives the Latin in a note. Perhaps, as all turns with the Jesuits on technicalities, the indulgence is wrapped up in the word *required*. Or, on the *opus operatum* principle, the repetition of a prayer is enough, without mental attention. Either way, there is ample license. I should perhaps subjoin here, that Father Boyer's book, as well as books like it, was published anonymously. This was not to avoid authorship, but a dose of Jesuit poison!—See *Mendham's Literary Policy*, etc., 2d ed. p. 186, note.

the banner of England is not somewhere floating; and wherever that banner floats, the archiepiscopal authority of Canterbury is respected and honored. In order, I suppose, to maintain the ecclesiastical integrity of the world-wide British empire, an archbishopric has never been created out of, what may be called, the home kingdom.[z]

But to proceed. Archiepiscopal jurisdiction is not a thing apt to be unestimated by Roman appraisers; nor is archiepiscopal vigilance apt to take anodynes, when Romish Church-extension is a subject for its forecast. Scarcely is Augustine mounted on his new and pretentious throne, than we begin to hear of his provincial functions, put into actual exercise. He contrives to find out, now, that there is an old and a full-formed Episcopal Church in the western portion of the country which he had adopted as *his own*, and which he designed to create as a theatre for his manifold triumphs. Why, (if he were a pacific, tolerant Christian, who was anxious for the dissemination of the truth as it is in Jesus) why should his first effort be, *not* to see how he could help his fellows in the faith, his colleagues in office—his elder colleagues—the free-born and native-born occupants of the soil, but to see how he could subject them to his sway, and

z Some of the ancient archiepiscopal dignity of London yet belongs to it. The Bp of London is *Primus Baro Regni*, the first baron of the realm; and the Abp of Canterbury has no provincial right of visitation in his diocese.—*Allen's History of London*, vol. ii. p. 306. It would be more primitive, and more British, if England were to restore the ancient ecclesiastical regime, and have an Abp of London, and an Abp of St. David's. This might easily be done on the death of the present Abp of Canterbury.

treat them as his subordinates and suffragans? A forbearing mind can sometimes say of a communion which it pities,

> "If the rude waste of human error bear
> One flower of hope, oh pass, and leave it there?"[a]

But Augustine, as soon as he feels a Romish pallium's quickening, forgets the counsel of the Saxon king upon the subject of compulsion. He invites the British bishops of the West to a conference; or, as the issue proved, summoned them to an audience, to listen to his autocratical dictation. He, a foreigner and an Italian, who had not so much as received Episcopal consecration under the skies which had covered themselves from birth-time, requires the old-established prelates of the land to stand before him, as pupils before a master.[b] He had inquired (as the issue showed) into their faith in fundamental Christian verities, and found it blameless. They were not Arians, they were not Pelagians, they were not enemies of, or strangers to, Episcopacy, or creeds, or liturgies. He could not fault them about any thing essential in doctrine, or in discipline; for the Church of Rome did not then vary materially from old and genuine catholic truth, but in a single particular—the supremacy of

a Southey's Vindiciæ, p. 137.

b He here violated, most egregiously, the eighth canon of the General Council of Ephesus.—See section fourth of Palmer's British Episcopacy Vindicated against Dr. (now Cardinal) Wiseman. Also a canon of the Council of Arles, (A. D. 314,) which was *general* for the West.—*Albaspinæi Observationes*, p. 390. According to Van Espen, he would have had no right to trump as high as he did, even if a Papal legate.—*Jus Canonicum*, pars i. tit. 21, ch. 3, n. 1.

her bishop.[c] This was the crux, to which Augustine must bow and bind them; and so prefacing it with matters, (which may come up hereafter, to show that the British Christians did not derive from Rome even the minutiæ of their system,) with matters of comparatively trifling moment, in themselves considered, he concluded his appeal with a demand of unconditional surrender to himself, and the power he represented, as their ecclesiastical superiors and sovereigns.[d] They were to place themselves and their Church entirely at his disposal, and join him in a crusade[e] for the conversion of the heathen, who would,

c I am very sorry to say it, but I am afraid, that if Gregory *talked* against the supremacy, he *acted* for it. A desire for the supremacy certainly existed at that time; and Bp Overall even supposes, that one reason why Sabinian wished to have Gregory's books burned, was, that, he had made imprudent *verbal* concessions against pontifical power.—*Convocation Book*, ed. 1690, p. 286. I am quite inclined to believe, that if Sabinian had had his way, not a great many Ultramontanes would have cried their eyes out. Febronius [Bp Hontheim] speaks of Gregory, *debitâ reverentiâ*, but admits that he stretched his power, *ultra nativos fines*.—See his treatise, *De Statu Ecclesiæ*, vol. ii. ch. 5, § 3, or p. 420. Prof. Palma even contends that Gregory was not ready only, but very zealous, and deeply anxious, to defend the natural rights of the Primacy. Nay more, that those rights he was ready to exact, "accurate et constanter." (Prælectiones, i. 417.) What a *Romish* conception of the *natural* rights of the Roman Pontiff are, any intelligent theologian knows; and what, too, a precise and persevering exaction of those rights—especially with the Inquisition to back them! So, Palma being witness, Gregory, how demiss soever in *words*, was in *deeds* a full-blown Pope!

d An old French authority, quoted by Collier from Spelman, "affirms expressly, that Augustine did demand subjection to him, as the Pope's legate; but Dinoth, in the name of those Churches, refused it."—*Collier's Ecc. Hist.* i. 179; *Abp Parker's Correspondence*, Parker, Soc. ed. pp. 111, 112.

e A crusade is not too strong a word; for Gregory advised Ethelbert to spread Christianity by exhortation, terror, flattery, and correction.—Bede, bk i. 32; or, vol. ii. 148.

of course, become not their disciples but his own—his spiritual wards, whom he might use for such ecclesiastical taxation as he, and he alone, should determine to be proper.

Augustine descanted like a lordling, and a genuine satellite of the great central authority of the Roman system. His British auditors were as modest and humble as little children; and, with unsophisticated simplicity, asked for a second audience, and time for consultation, declaring that they could do nothing "without the consent and leave of their people."[f] In these quoted words, (as I would remark in passing,) the ancient British Christians showed abundant deference for a feature in Church discipline, which has ever been Rome's special detestation—the mixture of the laity with the clergy, in the consideration and settlement of momentous ecclesiastical questions. And I cheerfully add, may God forefend the day when "the consent and leave of the people" be banished from the discipline of any who profess and call themselves Christians![g]

f Bede, bk ii. ch. 2.

g Mr. Palmer is high-church enough, I hope, for most people; yet he hesitates not to give the following testimony: "The Church has never flourished more, nor has the Episcopate ever been held in truer reverence than under the guidance of those apostolical prelates, who, like St. Cyprian, resolved to do nothing without the consent of the Church, and who have most sedulously avoided even the appearance of being 'lords over God's heritage.'"—*Treatise on the Church*, third edition, 1842, ii. pp. 303, 304. Even in the Gallican Church, (as Mezeray says, quoted by William Watson, LL. D., in his treatise on Church law,) the practice of esteeming the voice of the people, in conferring Church benefices, as the voice of God, prevailed down to the tenth century.—*Watson's Clergyman's Law*, fourth edition, 1747, p. 4. Hospinian, de Origine Templorum, p. 426, shows that the laity, in the Church's better days, could not give away

The old British Christians were, but too clearly, bad *Roman* Catholics; yet, though simple-hearted, they were prudent men, and before they would trust themselves, a second time, with the magisterial Augustine, they not only consulted generally with "the people," but sought special advice from an experienced and venerated hermit. He gave them a plain and explicit test, by which they might determine, whether Augustine meant to treat with them as brethren and equals; or show them that he would only accept of their submission as a liege lord. The test failed; and then at last, penetrating the depths of his outrageous usurpation, they answered with as flat, and positive, and fixed a denial, as ever fell from British lips. I would fain give you more details, did time allow; but the terms of this denial, relating to the stress of Augustine's requisitions, and showing that they gauged his whole system from base to top-stone, I cannot forbear from quoting.

"Be it known, and without doubt unto you," said

their property to the Church without the consent of government. According to Hospinian, then, the laws lately passed in some of the United States, forbidding the control of Church property to ecclesiastics, are perfectly correct. While alluding to Hospinian, whose antiquarian lore was profound, I venture to say, that in the treatise just quoted, p. 399, he advances the opinion that weekly, instead of monthly, oblations, i. e., for the Communion, and poor communicants, were adopted by Fabian, Bishop of Rome, not for a *theological*, but a *prudential* reason; because the number of Christians was so rapidly increasing. Fabian was bishop from 236 to 250. Weekly communions, at their commencement, were evidently not designed for *all*, but to accommodate increasing numbers. A very probable and rational origin; and they who talk of them as *morally* obligatory, transcend their commission. Caranza, Archbishop of Toledo, in his Summa Conciliorum, sustains the reference of Hospinian.—See *Summa*, p. 20, Louvain, 1681.

their mouth-piece, in the name of all his brethren, "that we all are, and every one of us, obedient subjects to the Church of God, and to the Bishop of Rome, and to every godly Christian, to love every one in his degree, in perfect charity, and to help every one of them, by word and deed, to be the children of God. And other obedience than this we do not know to be due to him, whom you name to be Pope, nor to be father of fathers; and this obedience we are ready to give, and to pay, to him, and to every Christian continually. Besides, we are under the government of the Bishop of Caerleon-upon-Usk, [the old Welsh archbishopric,][h] who is, under God, appointed to superintend us, and to cause us to continue in the spiritual way."[i]

I might comment long upon the forbearance, the moderation, the equanimity, and the urbanity of this ever-memorable manifesto of our far-gone forefathers. I will only use respecting it, a word which, if not very classic, will enable you longest to remember its char-

h Caerleon is in Monmouth County, twenty-six miles from Bristol, one hundred and forty-eight from London; once, the metropolis of all Wales. Hence, an archbishop's see. Here King Arthur once flourished; and here inaugurated the Knights of the Round Table. Caerleon means *The Fort of the Legion:* the Roman Legion stationed there. The Romans found it so difficult to subjugate the Welsh, that *two* of the *three* legions in all Britain were stationed near them, or among them.—*Heylyn's Cosmographie*, second edition, p. 323.

i Chronicles Anc. Brit. Ch. pp. 160, 161. Comp. Fuller, vol. i. 149. Joyce's Brit. Synods, p. 119. Collier, i. 178. *Williams's Antiquities of the Cymry*, pp. 143, 144. These notice the objections of Romanists to its authenticity. If the speech had told *for* Rome, instead of *against* it, it would have been accepted upon *half* the testimony which now sustains it. Had the Pope for an endorser, too! "It is condemnable in one what is commendable in another," said old Fuller, in his quaintness, who understood the rules for the rise and fall of the thermometer ecclesiastical, at Rome, uncommonly well.—*Fuller*, i. 342.

acter. It certainly has British *spunk* enough in it to entitle it to any page in the annals of our modern Reformation.*j* It satisfied Augustine that he had to deal with impracticable materials; and he at once gave way to violence. Language of fearful excitement rose to his lips, so that even Bede is constrained to confess he spake "in a threatening manner." If, said he, you will not join in unity with me, on the terms proposed to you, war shall come thundering to your doors. If you will not, in the way demanded of you, preach to the English nation, then you shall at their hands experience the vengeance of death.*k*

There, my Brethren, there, in the first grand display of its aims at power, and in the issue, you have an introduction to the Romish Church history of England, and an epitome of its genius, till the Reformation brought a change, which, may God grant it, shall continue to the end of mortal time. You see how it be-

j The Britons were infected with that spiritual malady which Dr. Lingard, in his own classic style, calls "pious obstinacy." The phrase occurs in his Anglo-Saxon Church, second edition, p. 108. He may, however, have caught the idea from Archbishop Wilfrid, who called those that sided with some of his auditors, about an unorthodox, i. e., a non-Roman Easter, "accomplices in obstinacy."—See *Giles's Bede*, ii. 367.

k The Latin words of Bede are *ultionem* and *mortis*. The vengeance of death is, of course, a literal and exact translation of it. Nevertheless, Mr. Jos. Reeve, while he talks of "Bede's unquestionable authority," suppresses the speech of Augustine, altogether; and Dr. Lingard and Mr. Newman gloss over the language, with euphemisms. This is all consistent, no doubt, and all done *permissu superiorum*. But the impracticable Latin, and the significant fact that an Italian was the speaker, are awkward things, and not easy to forget. *Dolcissimo Mortali è la Vendetta* is a consecration of the sweetness of revenge, worthy of an Italian poet, and a monk, too; and some of the blood, which thrills under such enjoyment, might have been flowing in Augustine's veins.—*Frauds of Monks*, etc., fifth edition, London, 1725, i. 55.

gins, with the faulting of all opponents as enemies of the Church Catholic; as if Rome were herself the Church, the whole Church, and all the Church[l]—the Church in comprehension, and the Church in centralization—the one, single, all-excluding representative of Christianity below. You see its next step, comply with my directions—hearken to my decisions—submit to me implicitly.[m] And if the slightest symptom of a protestant spirit shows itself, then comes the inevitable penalty:—threatenings, threatenings fierce and dire—enemies, and enemies who can wield the murderous sword—at once are talked of; and finally death, and death in any shape, which embittered enemies can devise.

Oh, how Romish! how intensely, and characteristically, and pervadingly Romish and Italian! Every one is wrong but me—every one must submit to me—every dissenter from my platform is a despiser of eternal salvation,[n] and may be treated as an outcast from the pale of charity, and the forbearance of compassion.[o]

l If anybody but a Romanist appropriates the title *Catholic*, say all the Latin prelates of Ireland, he but exposes his own shame.—Mendham's Literary Policy, pref. p. xxxii.

m *Obtemperare*, is Bede's word in Augustine's speech. A pretty strong one for compliance, conformity, submission.—Bede, bk ii. ch. 2. Yet, says J. H. Newman, in his own, or his adopted life of Augustine, (p. 227,) they must have had "sensitive ears" to quarrel with it. And then he sneers at their "gratuitous manifestation of independence." If Constantinople had been the *talker*, and Rome the *talkee*, the word would have contained an indefinite amount of insolence and assumption; and an earthquake, like Lisbon's in 1755, been esteemed as little enough of recompense for its huge audacity!

n Bede, bk ii. ch. 2, last line in the chapter.

o "Nothing but universal supremacy, without the toleration of either

That is the opening of genuine Romish history in England; and most religiously was it adhered to, till the temper, which erewhile rebelled against tyrannical and inexorable supremacy, revived, after a thousand years' slumber, like a giant refreshed with wine, and enacted the emancipation of the sixteenth century. England is once more free, and the subalterns of Italy no more her dictators. May the heart of her fathers be given, henceforth and forever, to all her children; and the bondage of ecclesiastical servitude never again be her bane and her curse.

actual resistance or mental inquiry, can satisfy a power which boasts itself the representative of Deity, and the possessor of its sublimest attributes."—*Townsend's Eccl. and Civil History Philosophically Considered*, ii. 502, 503. "This has uniformly been one part of the policy of Rome—never to recede from a claim, however unjust, or however resisted."—Ibid, i. 475. I have quoted these sentences from Dr. Townsend, as from a divine of a moderate school, and a most charitable disposition. But if *his* authority, for a pretty strong sentiment, is not enough to back me, let us see what Bp Butler has said, who was supposed, by some, to be so favorably inclined to Rome, that he died a Papist in spirit, if not in form. "Whoever will consider the popish claims to the disposal of the whole earth, as of Divine right, to dispense with the most sacred engagements, the claims to supreme, absolute authority in religion; in short, the general claims which the canonists express by the words *plenitude of power*—whoever, I say, will consider popery as it is professed at Rome, may see that it is manifest, open usurpation of all human and Divine authority."—*Bp Butler's Works*, Oxford, 1844, ii. 285. The Bishop adds, that persecution is *professed* by the Romish Church, and absolutely *enjoined* upon it. Strong as his language may read to some, it seems not unnatural, when we know that Archbishop Parker himself began with languge full as strong, if not, in the estimation of many, much stronger. This is the way in which he expostulated with the deprived Romish prelates—Heath and others. "Ye have made it sacrilege to dispute of his fact, [the Pope's actions,] heresy to doubt of his power, paganism to disobey him, and blasphemy against the Holy Ghost to act or speak against his decrees."—*Parker's Correspondence.* Parker, Soc. ed. p. 112.

LECTURE IV.

BEARING OF THE NEW RELIGION FROM ROME TOWARDS THE OLD CHRISTIANITY WHICH IT ENCOUNTERED IN THE BRITISH ISLES.

THE last, that is, my third lecture on the Early History of Christianity in England, enabled me to complete a brief review of six centuries, and to commence with an era, which Romanists have been disposed to consider as the foundation of the British Church under the auspices of Gregory the Great—the last but one among the saints of the (so-called) successors of St. Peter.

You saw something of the immediate and proximate and more praiseworthy causes which prompted Gregory to act in the premises; and of the manner in which his action was seconded and carried out. You saw how that to call the era in question, the chronological foundation of the Church of England, when there were bishops scattered over the western and north-western portions of Britain, in Cornwall, Wales, and Cumberland, and a bishop with his clergy on the very spot they first proposed to occupy, is so extravagant an assumption as to be altogether preposterous.

You saw that the agent of Gregory was so far from acting as an auxiliary to the ancient Christians whom he found upon British territory, that he would have nothing at all to do with them, unless, while they had a long-established primate of their own, they would abandon him for a new superior from Rome, whom they were to welcome as an angel, and bow down to as an absolute vicegerent:—an act of violent and impudent intrusion, of which I may, perhaps, give you some idea, by saying, that its parallel in our times would have been, for the first Romish bishop who came to these states, in 1790, to have commanded Episcopalians in a body to desert Bishop White and his colleagues, and to transfer all their allegiance to him. Had he done so, Americans would have shut him up in Bedlam, or hooted him from the land. For our British forefathers to bid Augustine the lesser to be gone about his business, when he made such a demand, and precisely such a demand of them, is in the idea of the historian Bede himself—committed to Romish dominion—to despise the offer of eternal salvation—i. e., to degrade one's self to the lowest of moral levels, that of scoffing infidelity![a]

The whole conduct of Gregory evinces, that he was anxious, not so much to Christianize Britain, as to Romanize it[b]—to reduce it to spiritual subjection, to himself and his successors.[c] Why, he labored to

a Bede, bk ii. ch. 2, last sentence, p. 179.

b "He was the first Pope and leader of the Pontifical Companies, and the last Bishop of Rome."—*Birckbeck's Protestant Evidence*, 2d ed. p. 238.

c "Under his subjection" was the exact understanding of the matter by the British; as Bede gives it, (bk ii. ch. 2, p. 176,) from their own lips.

thrust upon Britain, not a Romish Episcopacy alone, but Romish canon law:[d]—the very first provision of which took care of the punishment of those who stole any thing from the clergy! He did not so much as dream (good easy devotee of self-conceit) that it was possible for him, or his clergy, to steal any thing from others, though in the shape of some of human nature's dearest rights! His pioneer, Augustine the lesser, would not receive Episcopal consecration from the bishop at hand; nor from the bishops of France, nearest and most accessible. Nay, from several answers which Gregory made to some of his queries for instruction, it may not unfairly be inferred, that he, Augustine (not one of the lesser saints in ecclesiastical ambition) desired to have the French bishop, already in Kent, at the court of Ethelbert, made completely subordinate to his control. Gregory had to restrain a little his zeal for exclusive jurisdiction; but he surrendered the British bishops, nay, *all* the British bishops to his voracity, without a single qualm.[e] This, too, in the very teeth of a canon which Gregory had sworn

d Giles's Bede, ii. p. 189; bk ii. ch. 5. Muscutt's History of Ch. Laws, p. 11. George Long's Discourses before the Middle Temple, 1847, p. 87. The preference of the Romish clergy for the Roman law is, of course, easily explicable, in view of such an instance as is cited in the text. *Some* of the English monarchs also favored the introduction of Roman law; and Fortescue gives us the secret of *their* preference. "There is a noted sentence, a favorite maxim, or rule, in the Civil Law, that 'That which pleases the Prince has the effect of a law.'"—*Amos's ed. of Fortescue de laudibus legum Angliæ*, p. 125. "The prince did his utmost to elude the authority of the English laws; and the nation, on the other hand, labored hard to confirm it."—*Irving's Introduction to the Study of the Civil Law*, 4th ed. 1837, p. 85.

e Giles's Bede, ii. 119; bk i. ch. 27. Answer to seventh question. At the end. Lloyd's Brit. Ch. p. 80.

to observe;[f]—it being once the fashion of popes, to promise, on oath, to respect and execute the laws of the Church—a somewhat embarrassing fashion how-

[f] Council of Ephesus, Canon viii. Which canon, with a host of others, he had sworn to observe, *tota devotione*. See his strong pledges, in *Routh's Opuscula*, Oxford, 1840, i. 363. *Forbes's Historie Theology*, vol. i. p. 237. *Maimbourg, Traite Historique*, etc., p. 202.

The Pope's old oath to obey the canons is a matter of such consequence, that perhaps some further reference ought to be made to it. It was well known to the divines of France, as Maimbourg shows. De Marca also insists on it, *De Concordia*, vol. i. pp. 152, 153. After the year 1000, he says, France was as zealous for the majesty of the canons as ever, and as opposed to Rome's extra-canonical or anti-canonical decrees, vol. i. p. 221. One of the most remarkable testimonies upon the subject has been preserved by Dr. Routh, in his Opuscula, vol. ii. p. 154. Comp. Launoii Epistolæ, Cantabridgiæ, 1689, pp. 519, 716. There, from the *Liber Diurnus* of the Pontiffs themselves, he shows that the *ancient* Popes solemnly declared, that all those persons, and all those articles of faith, which the first six General Councils vouched for, they vouched for, as *rectæ fidei consortes*, as their ecclesiastical kindred; and venerated them in word, and in spirit, with the same affection as that which was bestowed upon them by the same sacred synods. Now it is most remarkable, that the English Synod of Calcuith, A. D. 785, whose canons were digested and prepared beforehand by Papal legates, lays down, in its very first canon, the *same platform*, "that the terms of communion may be regulated, and the people instructed accordingly."—*Collier's Hist.* i. 322. *Soames's Anglo-Saxon Church*, 4th ed. p. 103. Of these six councils, Mr. Palmer, sustained by our homilies, distinctly affirms—"These are the only synods which the Church Universal has ever received and approved, as ecumenical."—*On the Church*, vol. ii. p. 141, 3d ed. *The Homilies*, 2d Part of the Homily on Idolatry, Oxford ed. p. 182, speaks of "those six councils which were allowed and received of all men." Compare Heathcote's Illustrations of the XXXIX Articles, Oxford, 1841, p. 87. Coleridge on the Scriptural Character of the Church of England, p. 467. So, then, at last it appears, that all Christendom (the Pope and every body else—Oriental, Roman, and Englishman,) was once contented with what those synods defined; and continued so, for at least eight hundred years! In the name of God, of reason, and of charity, is not this a sufficient test; and why should Christendom forsake this primitive foundation? The East and the West would, I believe, go back to it to-morrow, if they could; and Rome (after having once avowed it with the utmost solemnity, as ample for "terms of communion") be the only dissenter! Who, then, is the changeling? who the defaulter in charity? in what communion are now most abundant "men of good will?"

ever, which they have for many centuries conveniently forgotten.[g]

Indubitably Gregory was *great*, if being a *great*, a GRAND Church politician entitled him to the distinction of so honorable an appellation.[h] He labored every way to widen, ramify, and consolidate papal authority. He is the pope who first struck a fatal blow at the independence of an apostolic episcopate, by rendering various orders of monks free from episcopal control, and directly dependent upon himself.[i] This virtually constituted him the author of those famous orders of the Church of Rome, such as the Dominicans and Franciscans, and finally the Jesuits—which have sometimes been called the body-guard of the pope; whose interest it is to magnify and glorify his authority to the utmost, and which (with the help of the Council of Trent) have reduced the episcopacy of the Church of Rome to such a degree of abject

g Richerius, Hist. Gen. Coun. vol. i. ch. 8, § 45; or, vol. i. p. 249. Maimbourg's Traité Historique, etc., ch. xx. Fullwood's Roma Ruit, p. 61, note. De Marca, de Concordia, etc., i. pp. 152, 153. Abp De Marca and Abp De Dominis (de Repub. Eccles. part i. p. 331,) say the Pope cannot disobey the canons. De Dominis would, of course, be suspected by a Papist; but De Marca is lauded by Cardinal Wiseman. See High Ch. Claims, p. 76, London, 1841.

h Sueur hits off his character well, when he says, he was supple and adroit, and knew just how to accommodate himself to times and individuals. That is, he was a cunning politician.—*Histoire de l'Eglise et de l'Empire*, vol. vi. p. 6.

i Bower's Popes, ii. 522; Giannone's Naples, i. 233, 234; Townsend's Hist. Chron. Considered, ii. 11; Hospinian de Monachis, nova ed. p. 233; or, lib. iv. ch. 10. He also acquitted, at Rome, a priest condemned for heresy at Constantinople.—*Du Pin's Hist. Ecc. Writers*, i. 569. And then complained of Constantinople, for having a bigger *name*, while he assumed the bigger *authority*. This is true Gregorian consistency!

humiliation, as to destroy its ancient independence.[j] In the Roman Church, a bishop is a mere creature of papal construction or annihilation;[k] and the Council of Trent rendered this feature of Roman economy a fixture, by denying that there is any episcopal authority in the Catholic Church, save as concentrated in, and emanating from, the pope, wholly and alone.[l] It was this view of episcopacy (the monarchical or imperial one) which Luther and Calvin dissented from and resisted—a republican episcopacy (in which bishops are, like the governors of our States, mostly the mere executive officers of the Church) they favored; and the disciples of Luther still favor it, in form, if not in name.[m]

j Palmer on the Church, 3d ed. ii. 438; Gee's ed. of Parson's Jesuits' Memorial; Abp De Pradt du Jesuitism; Duller's Jesuits as they were and are; Lathbury's State of Popery and Jesuitism in England; Nicolini's History of the Jesuits; Father Boyer's Parallel between the Jesuits and the Pagans, trans. by S. Whateley, London, 1738; Leone's Jesuit Conspiracy; Michelsen's Modern Jesuitism; Poynder's History of the Jesuits, with a Reply to Dallas's Defence, etc.; Wordsworth's Letters to Gondon; Steinmetz's Jesuits; an article from the English Review, reprinted by Joseph Robinson Baltimore—one of the best tracts upon the subject ever issued.

k Geddes's Tracts, vol. ii. dedication, first paragraph; Palmer on the Church, 3d ed. ii. 439. "All Romanist prelates are what they are, not by Divine Providence or permission, but by the grace of the Papal see!" —*Wordsworth's Letters to Gondon*, vol. i. 300.

l Father Paul's Coun. Trent, ed. 1676, pp. 570, etc.

m My lecture on Exclusiveness, pp. 35, etc. 3d ed., with the references. It was the monarchical episcopacy of Rome which the Abp Spalatro, the Primate of Dalmatia, (Anthony de Dominis,) endeavored to write down, in his famous *Respublica Ecclesiastica*. In the tenth section of that introductory chapter, in which he explains the grand design of his work, he distinctly says, that the Church under the Roman Pontiff, has ceased to be *a Church* (*i. e.*, an institution of the Lord,) and has become altogether an institution of man, *i. e.*, a mere *temporal monarchy*, of which the pope is the emperor.

Such an episcopacy as the pope's, (an imperial and ecumenical pontificate,) when presented to the view of the bishops of the ancient Church of Britain, was, as you saw by their reply to Augustine in council, a perfect novelty, and a completely inadmissible innovation. They protested against, and repudiated it, with unbending, unconquerable aversion. They disowned it, amid anathemas and threats of the direst vengeance.[n]

And this may satisfy you, that while the ancient British Christians were as decided Episcopalians as ourselves, they were just as decided opponents as ourselves of the monarchical, or rather imperial episcopacy of the popedom, which makes all authority tend to, and end in, a single point of concentration.[o] You could not have a more striking proof than this, that they were what we now call Protestants; for they dissented and resisted and rebelled and confronted all sorts of curses, the moment that *this*, which is the very corner-stone of Popery, was presented openly to

n Bede, ii. 2.—"They answered, they would do *none* of those things, nor receive *him* as their archbishop; for, they alleged among themselves, that 'if he would now rise up to us, how much more will he contemn us, as of no worth, if we shall begin to be under his subjection.'" Si ei subdi cæperimus. *Subdi* is a very strong word, and shows that the British understood the mensuration of Romish heights and distances extremely well!

o "The name *papa* continued common to *all* the bishops for 850 years, till Hildebrand, (Pope Gregory VII.,) in a council at Rome, A. D. 1073, decreed that there should be but one pope (meaning himself) in the whole world."—Bp Barlow's Brutum Fulmen, p. 144, quoting Baronius; Father Paul on Ecc. Benefices, 3d ed. 1736, p. 58; Art de verifier des dates, p. 286. So the system kept developing itself, till it culminated under a successor of Gregory I., who knew how to complete what the first pretended *servus servorum* had begun!

their inspection, and urged upon their allowance—nay, forced upon their allegiance. I say the corner-stone; for although many, and the generality of uninformed persons, regard other points as far more consequential, a well-informed theologian knows, in a moment, that the supremacy is the key-stone to the papal arch[p]—the bond of perfectness which unites the various parts of popery into a symmetrical whole—the nodule, from which can spring its interminable developments. Our old controversialists were accustomed to such a notion of it, and were not at all surprised to find Bellarmine (the Coryphæus of genuine Romish doctors) declaring to them, that a belief in the pope's supremacy is essential to salvation. It *is* essential to *Romish* salvation; for it is essential, it is altogether indispensable to the coherence and continuity of the Romish system.[q] I might believe all else of Romanism, and believe it pretty much after the interpretation of my own mind, and the control of my own will, if there were no supreme authority to dictate and enforce its own views of Romanism, as exclusive and indispensable. How easy, for instance, to adopt one article of Pope Pius IV.'s creed, and affirm that "due

p Paul's Hist. Coun. of Trent, ed. 1676, pp. 32, 33, 66; Geddes's Tracts, vol. ii. Tract first; Palmer on the Ch., 3d ed. ii. 369; Browne on the 39 Articles, vol ii. p. 607. Bellarmine said *all* Christianity depended on it.—Pref. de Sum. Pont. ed. 1721, vol. i. 494, opera. It is Bellarmine's articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ; De Maistre on the Pope, prelim. disc., p. xvi., says there is no *real* Christianity without it. Luther, in his characteristic way, said the Papists would hang St. Peter himself, if he were to come to life, and preach *all* other truth, yet deny the Supremacy.—Table Talk, No. 537, or, p. 234.

q Hussey on the Papal Power, pref. p. iv. and p. 208; Andrew Sall's True Catholic and Apostolic Faith, new ed. 1840, p. 198.

honor and veneration" are to be given to all the images of the Saints, if we can put upon "due honor and veneration" our own construction.

So, you perceive, the supremacy is the Alpha and Omega of Popery, its all in all—its centre and its circumference—its zenith and its nadir—its one single, everywhere-penetrating, all-animating, all-absorbing, all-controlling, never-bending principle. But this supremacy our British forefathers resisted, as completely and as energetically as their children of the days of the Reformation [r]

And there, to a theologian, I might leave the subject of the striking unlikeness of the ancient British Church to Popery, and what Popery most loves, most assiduously maintains, most inflexibly puts forward, as a test, as a rule, of ecclesiastical fealty. But such a treatment of the subject will not satisfy a promiscuous audience, and I must therefore go on to show that, not only in *the grandest point of all*, but in subsidiary ones also, our British forefathers by no means built up their Church after the style of Roman architecture.

Augustine brusquely accused them of going contrary to ecclesiastical unity; by which, of course, he

r Bp Lloyd says the British bishops comprehended Augustine as laying all stress on the Supremacy, as the only *real* point to gain.—*Brit. Ch.* pp. 80, 81; Inett's Orig. Angl., new ed. vol. i. pp. 53, 54; *Johnson's Vade Mecum*, 3d ed. 1709, pp. 3, 4. Neander comprehended Augustine's aims with philosophical precision. He says, he would "allow neither any partner in the dignity of his primacy over the whole English Church, nor any spiritual authority independent of his own."—*Church Hist.* Eng. ed. vol. v. 19. Why, even Geoffrey of Monmouth, thus reads it: "Augustine required the subjection of the British bishops."—*Old English Chronicles*, Bohn's ed. p. 275.

meant (what all Papists now mean) not the unity of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds—the unity of the Church Catholic—but the unity of the Church of Rome, which, in another place, he deliberately called the Church catholic, or universal.[s] He accused them of doing thus, *not* as Bede's translators make him say, in *several* things besides; but, as the original Latin has it, in *very many* other things.[t] Two of these Augustine specified, with some precision; and declared he was ready to let the others subside, as, no doubt he might have done with consummate safety, if he had gained his chief point, which leaks out in a *covert* manner, but which our shrewd forefathers comprehended, and to which they answered with *pointed* frankness, and unshrinking self-possession.

The two items, which Augustine specified, related to the exact time for the observance of Easter; and, (as I have before said, meaning to explain myself when the time came,) to the proper seasons for the administration of baptism. Unquestionably, (as the British bishops foresaw,) these were mere foils for the chief point, which came last in order, and which was adroitly (and shall I not say Jesuitically?) covered up by, and garnished over with, the plausible idea of *joining him*—and, of course, as his subordinates and assistants, in a mission to the Saxons. Nevertheless, it is well for us that he propounded them; for they answer two important historical purposes. They show,

s Bede, bk ii. ch. 2; Giles's Bede's Works, vol. ii. p. 177.

t Giles's Bede, vol. ii. p. 172, alia plurima, unitati ecclesiasticæ contraria.

at one and the same time, how thoroughly the ancient British Church (so to speak) *disresembled* the Roman; and what a slavish subjection to itself the Roman Church insisted on, even at that comparatively early period, in the progress of Christianity.

The festival of Easter,[u] on which all the other variable festivals of the ecclesiastical year depend, is called, in our Prayer Book, a movable feast. It corresponds, in this particular, to the Passover of the Jews, for which it is the parallel and substitute. That Passover was made dependent on the full moon, which happened on, or next after the vernal equinox. And, as Palestine was a small, narrow country, the full moon would be, astronomically, the full moon to all the land, at nearly the same moment of time. But when you would fix a festival, dependent on an astronomical event, on the same day for the whole round world, then, it is evident, that a basis, different from an *exactly* astronomical one, must be resorted to. Hence the language in our Prayer Book, under the table for finding Easter day "from the year 1900 to the year 2199 inclusive," about "the ecclesiastical full moons," and "the real full moons," and the means whereby they "may fall *nearly* on the same days." The Council of Nice, A. D. 325, found the Church Catholic at variance with itself, about the observance of Easter, and instituted a rule which might make its observance

u For an able paper on the computation for Easter, see the London Quarterly Review, vol. xviii. p. 496. Chronicles of the Anc. Brit. Ch. 2d edit. note, p. 185. Inett's Origines Anglicanæ. Griffith's edit. pt. i. ch. v. § 2, note 1; or pp. 95, 96. Griffith's notes to Inett are very valuable.

uniform throughout the globe. But even the great council (guided as it had to be by astronomers) was practically wrong. It had adopted eighty-four years as a cycle—a period of revolution—in which the ecclesiastical full moons, and the real full moons, after many variations, might be brought round to a common point of union, and start together again as if they had never differed. The astronomers of Alexandria subsequently discovered, that a cycle of nineteen years would be more correct, and less tedious; and this cycle was adopted at Rome about A. D. 530.[v] This is the cycle adopted in our Prayer Book, in the table (so called) "of the days on which Easter will fall." It is always printed for thirty-eight years, or two cycles of the moon;[w] and by running the eye across the table, the uniformity of the two cycles will at once be discovered.[x] Any two Easters, which are nineteen years apart, always[y] occur in the same month, and on nearly the same day of the month.

Now the ancient British Christians knew nothing of the new cycle adopted at Rome, some seventy years before Augustine came from Italy, and assumed the

v A. D. 525.—Britons and Saxons not converted to Popery, p. 306. A. D. 527, according to Mr. Griffith. Even the cycle of nineteen years does not answer to perfection, the solar cycle exceeding the lunar cycle an hour and a half. Hence, Easter can only be calculated for limited periods. Art. de Verifier des Dates, p. xxii. Hale's Analysis of Chronology, i. 58.

w In our American books.

x Take the Standard, which has the cycles in parallel columns. Easter day for 1798, 1799, and 1800, occurred on *precisely* the same days as for 1817, 1818, 1819.

y Perhaps *generally* would be safer. But the remark is true, for the two cycles now in our American Standard book.

right to dictate to them, as if lord paramount of their natal soil.[z] They adhered, accordingly, to what a Catholic Council *had* prescribed, and rejected what a Pope *would* prescribe,[a] thereby proving themselves to be, what no doubt they were, Catholics of a primitive type, and not Catholics after the degenerate stamp of Rome. They were astronomically wrong, as we ourselves now admit, by adopting the cycle of nineteen years, instead of the old one of eighty-four. But they were slow to listen to a Pope, even with science on his side, (not Romanism's usual predicament, as cases like Galileo's abundantly show,)[b] just as England was slow to listen to him about the reformation of the calendar. The New Style, which was adopted at Rome in 1582, was not adopted by the Parliament of Great Britain till

z Some people say they were Quatuordecimans, or those who kept the festival on the day of the moon's fulling; i. e., the fourteenth day, or the middle of a lunar month, come what day of the week it might. But Bede admits that the British always kept Easter on a Sunday. It is true, he appears to contradict himself; but the apparent contradiction (it must be said at all hazards) is a Pope's blunder, and not Bede's! I freely exonerate him from the charge brought in Brown's Fasciculus, vol. ii. 842. Compare Giles's Bede, ii. 325, and vi. 324.

a Britons and Saxons, etc., p. 307.

b Galileo may be out of Purgatory at last. His name was "silently and furtively withdrawn, in the year 1835," from the condemned list. Copernicanism is *now* not more than a venial sin—perhaps not that.—Mendham on the Index of Gregory XVI., London, 1840, pp. 15–18. The silent and furtive assent to Copernicanism is very characteristic. Rome never acknowledges an error openly. The genuine reason for Galileo's condemnation is rarely given. An astute scholar of the University of Cambridge, Eng., has supplied it, in one of those curious volumes of tracts, called The Phenix. "Galileo indeed fell under correction, for holding the motion of the earth; but the true crime was his abusing his Holiness in his dialogues, under the name of Simplicius."—*Phenix*, London, 1708, ii. p. 517.

1752,[c] one hundred and seventy years afterwards; and, until that time, the 25th of March continued to be New Year's Day. The New Style is not yet adopted in Russia, so that, in some respects, the Greek Church assumes towards Rome a Protestant attitude, which we have thought proper to lay aside.[d]

All this conspires to show, that, so far as the example and dictation of Rome is concerned, our early British forefathers were more suspicious, and more impracticable than their posterity.[e] They would not reform their calendar, under any authority but what they considered supreme and final—the legislation of an ecumenical council—a body which we might call a congress, or a parliament, for "the Holy Catholic Church," of our baptismal creed.

The subject of Baptism, also, as understood by them, will bring out, as I shall now proceed to show, a precisely similar result.

Augustine did not explain his meaning to the British, when he arraigned them for an anti-Roman practice about baptism; at least, Bede has not given us his explanation, and we are obliged to reach it by other

c Hale's Analysis of Chronology, 2d edit. i. 53.

d Every anti-Romanist is a Protestant, says De Maistre, Trans. p. 300.

e "Brittania vulgo male audit, quoties de [Romana] fide agitur."—Quoted from Erasmus in Soames's Reformation, vol. i. p. 158. And the secret is developed in a peculiarity, which Dr. Lingard ascribed to the ancient British; though rather reproachfully than otherwise. He says "The independence of their Church was the chief object of their solicitude. —*Anglo-Saxons*, p. 47. This trait, for which Dr. L. gives them any thing but credit, we, of course, esteem their noblest commendation. Be it remembered, that (Dr. L. attesting) *Church-independence* was a watchward of our ancient British forefathers!—Compare *Twysden's Vindication*, ch. iii. § 79.

sources. It is supposed by some, that the ancient British Church baptized with a single affusion of water, and not with three affusions, as the Eastern Churches did, and as they still do.[f] But this is an undoubted error; for Gregory admitted that in his day, the Church of Rome still adhered to the ancient practice of baptizing with three affusions.[g] It is a simple fact, that baptism by a single affusion was introduced, and for very obvious reasons, by the Unitarians[h]—whom the Church of Rome, (for it is her policy to imitate Unitarians, or any body else, when she can safely promote her own popularity,) for her own sake certainly and not for theirs, was complaisant enough to copy.

So the Church of England did not at this time vary from the Church of Rome, about the number of affusions of water in baptism. It was, probably, about a still smaller matter, that the difficulty prevailed. The Church of Rome allowed baptisms only at Easter and Pentecost; while the Oriental Churches allowed it at Epiphany also. For a reason, which now it is not

f Joyce's Brit. Synods, p. 117, thinks Augustine wanted to enforce trine baptism. Churton is wrong. Griffiths, in his ed. of Inett, vol. i. p. 53, thinks he himself has *probably* hit it. My own reasons for varying from both are derived from Bingham.

g Bingham's Antiq. bk xi. ch. 11, § 8; or vol. iii. pp. 604, 605. The 2d canon of the Council of Calcuith settles the question. Shows what Rome meant. Collier, i. 322. Sozomen, bk vi. ch. 26; but comp. *the Greek* quoted in Bingham, iii. 603. Canisii Thesaurus, vol. iii. part i. p. 400. Neander, Eng. ed. iii. 437. "The narrow spirit of the Roman Church," says Neander, "was here again the *first* to lay a restraint on Christian liberty."

h The reference above to Sozomen, with a correction from the Greek in Bingham, shows that the Unitarians introduced the single affusion. Riddle's Christian Antiquities, p. 503, shows how the single affusion began in Spain, and how Gregory approved it.

very difficult for us to comprehend, Pope Leo I. (440–461) who was as good a hater of Constantinople as Gregory himself, prohibited baptisms at Epiphany, as "an unreasonable novelty."[i] This "unreasonable novelty" the British Christians, from their predilections for, and familiarities with Eastern religious practices, had in all probability long indulged in. But as a pope had denounced it, with the arrogation of plenary authority, and levelled against it his shafts of Italian lightning, it was of course to be esteemed a huge affair, and one to be dealt with on terms of a surrender at discretion, and on no others whatsoever.[j] To us it seems to be what would now be called "a matter of moonshine," whether candidates for baptism should receive that sacrament at two seasons annually, or at three. The stress laid upon it by Augustine, indicated to the British Christians, that there would be no possible chance of ecclesiastical liberty, in yielding to

i Bingham's Antiq. xi. 6, 7, or vol. iii. 514, 15. John Baptist Thiers, a French doctor of theology, in an exceedingly learned work on superstitions about sacraments and other ecclesiastical matters, shows from ecclesiastical history and the Fathers, that it is no novelty and no superstition, to baptize at other times than those ordained by Pope Leo. His work is in four duodecimo volumes; and it is to chapter sixth of the part on Baptism, volume second, that I particularly allude. I quote, too, from the fourth edition, and from one having the approbation, not only the King, but of the Faculty of Theology in Paris. Nevertheless, Thiers was too liberal a Romanist; and so, as Mr. Mendham says in his Literary Policy of Rome, he "has been conducted to the literary gibbet of his Church."—*Mendham*, p. 338, note, 2d edition.—The fact brought out by Mr. Mendham, strongly confirms what I have elsewhere said about the antipathies between French Romanism and Italian Romanism. The fourth edition of Thiers's work was printed at Paris in 1741.

j De Maistre says no man can sign, *upon his honor*, any creed but a Roman one. So we are not heretical only, but disgraced, *Prelim. Disc* p. xvi. Compare the decree of the Popish Bishops of Ireland.—*Mendham's Literary Policy*, pref. p. xxxii.

a party who carried conformity out to such remote and minute particulars; and they very wisely, as well as firmly, refused compliance. If they were never to bring a child or an adult to the font, to be dedicated to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, except when the Bishop of Rome pleased to say they might be permitted to do so—in Heaven's name, (one might ask,) what Christian discretion could they ever be entrusted with? Here was an assumption of authority, parallel only to that of God above, who called his own people, not to say their own words, or think their own thoughts on the day set apart especially for the honor of his peerless name.[k] But for one man to dictate to Christendom, to *all* Christendom, about the days of the year, when, and when only a sacrament is to be administered, is to carry supervision to an extent, and to drive autocracy to an extremity, which reduces all liberty to a chimera. I would renounce the ministry, (if there were no other remedy,) sooner than have a bishop presume to tell me, dogmatically, when and when only, I should administer the sacraments of grace and mercy. The British Christians renounced the authority which claimed jurisdiction to enact and enforce by unearthly penalties, such outrageous canon-law; and though the point involved were inconsiderable, the spirit which knows how to contend for *principle*—even though the matter embracing the principle be in itself quite trivial—will know how to respect and vindicate them. An unconstitutional tax of a penny would be resisted by England

[k] Isa. lviii. 13.

and America, as strenuously as John Hampden fought at great expense and toil, and for twelve successive days in the Court of Exchequer, against an unlawful tax of thirty shillings—and for a reason as obvious as it is cogent—the authority which may tax us unconstitutionally for a penny, may tax us with equal propriety for dollar after dollar, till it strips us of our earthly all.[l]

Augustine, probably, was somewhat afraid of British mettle, when he apparently condescended to forego many other differences between the British Christians and his Italian models; or, as I have hinted, he cared not to multiply his demands, so he could carry his main point—the acknowledgment of himself as their superior, including an unreserved submission to the Pope's supremacy. The fact, however, which he admitted, that there were many, *very many* differences between themselves and him, is too important a one to be overlooked; and I must draw towards it all possible attention.

You have remarked Gregory's aim in reference to dominion in England, from the temper which his instrument[m] Augustine exhibited, and the demands he vehemently insisted on. Now, if Rome, with the same

l See the effects of Romish demands for pennies, magnified into all sorts of revenue, to astonishing enormities, in "Staveley's Romish Horseleech; or, an Impartial Account of the Intolerable Charge of Popery to this Nation," &c. Staveley was an antiquarian and a lawyer. Died, 1683. See also Twysden's Vindication, chap. iv. "Of the payments to the Papacy from England." Twysden's invaluable work is now accessible in a new edition by Parker & Son, London.

m "His creature," says John Johnson, that immaculate high-churchman, in his Vade Mecum, part i. p. 3.

unchangeable aim, the same inflexible temper, had known England sooner, would such *more than many, very many*[n] differences, between herself and England, have existed; or, if they existed, would they have received a momentary toleration? Never, my Brethren, never; never, a hundred times repeated. If England, in the six centuries preceding Augustine's, (shall I say invasion?) had been, in any wise, known to Rome as a fief ecclesiastical—in any wise been subject to Rome's authority—these many, very many differences, these unreasonable novelties, would all have been planed down into smooth and level uniformity—would all have melted away, like grim ghosts into the thinnest vapor—and have been supplanted by the one invariable pattern, minted at the Vatican. Then, when Augustine first trode on British territory, no miracle would have been necessary for an unwonted Roman sandal. Then, he would have felt completely at home, as in the city of the seven hills, and would have exclaimed, 'O happy land, where the true light shineth, and all is unbroken symmetry!' He stood upon that land, however, evidently an alien and a stranger. It was unlike, almost utterly unlike, the land from which he came. Again, and again, he encountered dissimilarity, resistance, opposition, and repulsion, till at last (O climax of horrors!) the authority he deems most sacred and puissant on earth, is set at nought, as coolly as this congregation would set aside the decretals of the Romish metropolitan of the City of New York. The

n The Latin words are *plurima* and *perplura*.—Bede, bk ii. ch. 2; and bk v. ch. 18. Giles's ed. vols. ii. 172, and iii. 234.

ghastly contrast overwhelms him. His surging passions drown his reason. He breaks out into paroxysms of rage. Threats come out from the foam of his lips. Death is the watchword of his belligerent tongue, and the predestination of his embittered heart.[o]

All this goes to demonstrate (*to demonstrate* is my phrase, because the proof is cumulative, and irresistible, like that of a proposition in mathematics) that the old Church of England was no child of Rome—no possible bantling, or nursling, of Rome—had nothing whatever to do with Rome's paternity, or relationship, or wardship—but *was* as independent, and *had been* as independent, as providential circumstances and untrammelled Christian liberty could make her. Augustine offered no pretension, not the shadow—not the shadow of a shade of a pretension, to any original claim of Rome upon England's affiance and subordination—a thing he would not have failed to do, had he the remotest propriety on which to base an argument, or even a rhetorical appeal. He charged England with no separation from Rome, at any time; and assigned not the flimsiest solution for such a frightful schism—a thing which, could he have done it, he would have cast into the very teeth of his curious

o The events which this predestination foreshadowed are yet to be noticed; meanwhile, I will quote, as a warrant for my language, the commentary of the meek Thomas Morton, Bishop of Durham from 1632 to 1659,—"which speech, although some interpret as proceeding from the spirit of prophecy, as though Austin had now been dead; yet the concurrence of the story, and their own Galfridus's report, doth rather bewray that policy was the dame of those events."—*Morton's Catholike Appeal for Protestants, out of the Confessions of the Roman Doctors*, London, 1610, lib. i. ch. 4, § 1; or, p. 60.

listeners; and which he would have wielded, as if he had stolen one of the thunderbolts of Jupiter. But we hear nothing of this—nothing at all like it—nothing bearing to it the most distant tie of consanguinity. The inference is palpable and resistless, that the Church of England, represented by the British bishops, at the conference held with Augustine, the representative of Gregory, was as utter a stranger to the Church of Rome, as to the hierarchy of the Mexicans, before the discovery of North America. The two Churches looked each other in the face, at that conference, for the first time, as parallel communions. But they found one another not so much as bare acquaintances. They could not approximate, still less could they associate, as equals; and the result was a parting which, on one side, seemed like the parting of a court of the Inquisition, when it consigns its outcasts to arbiters of life and death.

I speak of the (so-called) Holy and Apostolic Court of the Inquisition, and in this connexion, with express design; for, having now shown you the full significance of the council, called and conducted by Augustine—at least its full significance, as completely exonerating the ancient Church of England from all connexion with, and all knowledge of, the Church of Rome, as an authority or a pattern—I may now go forward with the history, and inform you how Augustine's threats to that Church eventuated.

The historian Bede indeed allows, that Augustine threatened the British Bishops, who disowned allegiance to his Italian master; but, out of lenity for, or

affinity with, that master's successors, he does not represent him as threatening like a man simply, but like a prophet—i. e., not denouncing vengeance personally, but as the august minister and vicar of Divinity. "All which," is his language "through the dispensation of the Divine judgment, fell out exactly as he had predicted."[p]

Now, hereby hangs a curious tale. Some time afterwards (as Romish writers generally pretend) there was a battle between the Saxon king of Northumberland,[q] and the ancient British, under the walls of the modern City of Chester, on the River Dee—a little south-east from Liverpool. When the battle was about to be fought, the Saxon monarch espied in the neighborhood a large number of ecclesiastics, from the monastery of Bangor, overlooking the armies as they deployed for conflict. This Bangor, you will understand, is not Bangor in Caernarvonshire, the seat of a Welsh bishopric, but a place much more inconsiderable, on the same river on which Chester itself is situated.[r] It was then one of the most celebrated schools of the prophets among the Welsh; and it is even said, that more than one thousand two hundred of its inmates were contemplating the battle of Chester, and offering up their prayers for the success of their companions

p Bede, ii. 2. Giles's Bede, ii. p. 177. The passage is susceptible of a translation which would show, that the predicted end was obtained by all sorts of instrumentalities. But the case is so bad, there is necessity for giving the worst aspect of it.

q The king of Northumberland, stirred up by Ethelbert of Kent, says Geoffry of Monmouth.—Lindsay's Mason, p. 88. Who stirred up Ethelbert? Of course *not* the meek and forbearing Augustine!

r About ten miles south of Chester.—Joyce's British Synods, p. 114.

in faith, and their brethren in home and blood. Bede says, that their establishment was divided into seven parts, with a rector for each, and not less than three hundred inmates in each of these sections. He calls them monks; but the recluses of those days were as different from the ragged and rancid representatives of the monastic system in our days, as cleanliness is unlike filth, and labor for an honest livelihood is different from lazy mendicity. Bede adds, that large as the establishment might be, all, *all* its occupants were accustomed (not did so occasionally) *accustomed* to live by the labor of their own hands.[s] These good, self-supporting men,[t] who were the theological professors and pupils of their country—its future catechists, schoolmasters, pastors, and bishops, were spectators of a scene on which their earthly destinies were hanging. They might have been bowing, or kneeling in prayer: they were certainly praying in their hearts, with anxieties amounting to agony. Who are these satellites of the British, rudely inquired the Saxon king, and what mean they by their presence? Being informed of their character and occupation, he exclaimed, with the fierce impiety of a pagan, "If, then, they cry to their god against us, in truth, though they do not bear arms, yet they fight against us, because they oppose us by their prayers." And immediately,

s Bede, bk ii. ch. 2. The Latin. Giles's Bede, ii. p. 178.

t The British clergy not a begging or grasping order. They refused the emperor's offer of support when attending a council, and maintained themselves. This illustrates their independence! Sulpit. Severus, ed. 1647, pp. 419, 20. They would not sell *their* votes even to a crowned head!

before he assailed their countrymen, he sent a detachment to fall on them without mercy, and cut them to pieces before his eyes. Completely unarmed, and altogether unready for such an onslaught, these hapless ecclesiastics sunk like grass beneath the scythe of the mower. Twelve hundred of them are said to have been slain, and but fifty to have escaped, so effectually was the order of the merciless infidel hastened to a catastrophe! And Bede, brought up under Augustinian tuition, tells the tale as coolly as if the vilest sinners upon earth had been extinguished—calls the victims perfidious and accursed, and despisers of salvation:[u]—when, behold, they are his Christian brethren, his brethren in the Christian ministry, and they die like martyrs under the blows of downright pagans —but die, (alas, for their luckless reputation!) die dissenters from the sovereignty of Rome!

The case is a horrid one, and has left horrid suspicions lingering about the memory of Augustine. Could he, in any way, have sanctioned or promoted this indiscriminate massacre of defenceless men—men of his own sacred order? No, say the Roman historians, confidently;[v] for he was then asleep in his sep-

u The words *nefandæ* and *perfidi*, and the close of § 2, on p. 178, vol. ii. Giles's Bede, are the things alluded to. They warrant all I have said. Evidently Bede sympathized with Augustine's furious displeasure against the anti-papal British.—Comp. Mason's Vindication, Lindsay's ed. 1728, pp. 88–90. Mason's language is none too strong. "This author [Bede] seems to have been generally governed by his passions in favor of the Saxons, and prejudice to the Britons, beyond all reason."

v J. Reeves's Hist. Christian Ch. i. 354.—The *death* of Augustine will not exonerate him. The massacre of St. Bartholomew took place on the 24th of August, 1572, when Pius V. was in his grave; and yet Pius V. was one of its chief promoters. His letters hurried on Charles IX.

ulchre, and had been, for several years. It is not possible, therefore, that the stain of such a ruthless and detestable crime can cleave to his sainted name. And I am quite willing to admit as much, so far as the technicality of the case is concerned. Augustine might have been *in* Paradise, or *out of* it, just as Roman annalists are pleased to have him—dead, if they choose to have it so, for many a long year, when the ecclesiastics of Bangor were baptized in their own guiltless blood. Yet, we are entitled to remember, the terms on which he parted with the old Church of England, and the terrific fate which, so far as he himself was concerned, was made ready for its insubmission. That fate was *war*—war accompanied by all its ensanguined horrors—bearing aloft as its ensign his own implacable watchword, "the vengeance of death."*w*

And now, is it to be supposed, that having predicted, (if the term is insisted on,) *predicted* such a mass of intolerable calamity, that he would never recur to it again, unless in the hallucinations of midnight? Would he have given it in his own mind, and, so far as he might, in the minds of those around him, a slumber as profound as that of the fabled seven sleepers? Would he (gentle-hearted son of compassion,) have done all in his power to avert it, by softening

to wage war against his Protestant subjects, "pium justissimumque bellum;" while he called Admiral Coligny the biggest liar in the world, and cursed his memory most heartily.—See Letters 41, 43, 44, of bk iii. *Goubau's ed.* Antwerp, 1640.

w And yet, as Dr. Lingard euphemistically says, he spoke only "in the anguish of disappointed zeal." Credat Judæus, etc., as say the Latins; or, as the French say, He who believes that must drink water, *i. e.*, to wash it down.—Anglo-Saxons, 2d ed. p. 148.

the acerbity of his half-converted adherents, and indoctrinating them in the sweetness of that most forbearing charity, which hopeth and endureth *all* things? Or would he, when he alluded to the Britons, do so in those terms of mock commiseration,[x] with which the Inquisition was wont to hand over its victims to the civil arm, for the infernal orgies of an Auto de Fe, (an *act of faith*, as that satanic tragedy was blasphemously denominated,) when heretics were burnt by the wholesale. It is an actual and simple fact, that when the Inquisition transferred its victims to the civil power, it did so with language upon its lips, whose double-distilled hypocrisy ought to have blistered a tongue of iron. It did so, most earnestly beseeching that power so to moderate its own sentence as not to touch blood, or to put life in any[y]—such is the incredible word—in *any* danger. Its *words* remind us of David, when he gave that significant charge to his captains, "Deal gently, for my sake, with the young man, even with Absolom;"[z] but the unvarnished truth is, that if the civil power had taken the Inquisition literally, and had forborne to carry those whom it discarded to the stake, it would itself have been forthwith subjected to the most abrading anathemas, and become liable to the very doom from which it was

x It should particularly be noted that Augustine did not threaten the Britons with the vengeance of Heaven, which he could not control; but with the vengeance of the Saxons, whom he might control—if he tried!

y Gedde's Tracts, i. 412; Limborch's Inquisition, bk 4, ch. 40; or, p. 458. This, too, when an Inquisitor-General (Valdez) demanded of the pope a power to burn the Lutherans!—Llorente's Inquisition, ch. xviii. p. 64, Amer. ed.

z 2 Samuel, xviii. 5

exhorted to shrink! And then Romanism can turn complacently round, and with a countenance as stolid as brass, inform us that her Church never inflicts capital punishments, and entertains a perfect horror of blood-shedding! *Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine*, as the Jesuit smoothly phrases it, in his courteous Latin, and presumes to glory in his communion, as an angel of mercy! Oh, my Brethren, Rome is an adept at a species of falsification, which I sometimes deem the basest and most malicious of any, because it proceeds from a studied purpose to deceive—an elaborate plan to deceive—a resolute determination to deceive—and because it achieves all the ends of deceit, far more adroitly than they could possibly be reached by a downright, and, in one respect, honest, because not sneaking or self-excusing, lie. But it is Rome's *chef d'œuvre*—her absolute triumph it is, to give us technical truth under a garb which will wheedle, and lull, and bejuggle us, twenty times, where a barefaced falsehood might hardly succeed in a solitary instance. She never rejoices in any emissary, so much as in one who can deal in, what Lord Lyttleton has so graphically called, "an embroidered lie"—a lie whose drapery will hide its iniquity, as silk and jewels can sometimes disguise a lack of feminine reputation.[a]

a For a multitude of references here, it may be enough to cite two works: one a Treatise on Equivocation, by the Jesuit Garnet, edited by D. Jardine, Esq., and published by Longman & Co., 1851; the other, Ligouri's Moral Theology, by Meyrick. This has been reprinted in the United States. Garnet's Treatise was known to Hospinian, (Hist. Jesuit, p. 372,) and to Foulis, the author of a work which D'Israeli, in his Charles I., vol. i. 221, note, calls "an extraordinary folio." See Foulis's Romish Treasons. London, 1671. p. 700, etc. Hospinian speaks of

Augustine had, perhaps, begun to practice this art, under Gregorian tuition; for, as you have seen, on the authority of a distinguished author of his own communion, Gregory could indulge in language, which ought to have dyed his face with double-hued crimson, when his worldly advantage was to be promoted, and put such language upon record to influence the examples of distant times.[b] So Augustine, Gregory-like and Inquisition-like, might have talked in honied terms to the Saxons, with any thing but honied meanings lackered over with a sugary exterior. He might have been such a man as the Psalmist alluded to, among the notorieties, i. e., the ante-dated Jesuits of his day—and the notorieties of any day, when political, and not conscientious aims govern men's actions, and they reach favorite objects by the plausible and circuitous, but none the less criminal methods, of the oily diplomatist, or the two-faced (perhaps I might better say, the ten-faced) demagogue. The words of his mouth might have been softer than butter, while he had war in his heart; his words might have been smoother than oil, while they were drawn swords.[c]

I cannot unpersuade myself, (as I read the marble-

Jesuitical equivocation as having become a *science*, when he wrote, in 1619, "Nostrâ autem memoriâ æquivocandi hanc scientiam, ab inferis resuscitatam," etc., *ut sup* p. 372. Pascal, who died in 1662, had warranted quite as strong language by his Provincial Letters, and Richerius had called the Vatican a shop of lies.—Comber's Roman Forgeries, pt 2, p. 67. If further testimony *can* be wanted, it may be found in the work of Edward Baines, on "The Church of Rome; her Present Moral Theology, Scriptural Instruction, and Canon Law." London, 1852.

b Llorente, Portrait des Papes, i. 166. Com. Foulke's Manual, 220. Robertson's Church History, vol. ii. p. 11, and note *e*.

c Psalm lv. 21.

hearted description of their fate, given by Bede, Augustine's pupil and admirer), that the blood of the poor ecclesiastics of Bangor may one day be found in the skirts of the first Romish Archbishop of Canterbury.[d] I would not stand the chance of that inquisition for blood, which may be made against him, before an inerrable tribunal, for all the palls and mitres, and croziers, and rings, which have fallen to his lot and the lot of all his Romish successors. If his—if Gregory's ecclesiastical ambition, slew a single unarmed and praying soul, at the battle of Chester; though Pagan swords did the accursed deed, then, by our Saviour's own decretal, it were better for them to have had millstones about their necks, and to have been drowned in the depths of the sea.[e] I do not say this because it is any part of my pleasure, or my plan, to disparage Augustine or his begilded patron.[f] I am cheerfully

d Thierry says Augustine lived a year *after* the battle. Norman Conquest, i. p. 40. And so says Florence of Worcester's Chronicle. Bohn's edit. pp. 9 and 10. The Romish historians generally contrive to send Augustine to Paradise, as quick as possible, in order to exonerate him from any instrumentality in the massacre of the monks of Bangor. In the newest edition of Bouillet's Dictionary of Geography and History, brought out under the auspices of the Pope and the Archbishop of Paris, he is made (p. 133) to live till 610. This, of course, *increases* the probability of his interference; but if his Holiness and Monseigneur *will* have it so, I suppose we must submit. There is the more reason to believe in Augustine's provocation of the deed, because, as Thierry shows, Rome treated the Saxons *just so*, when they resisted Rome in after days. (i. 50.) It is in consonance with Rome's *universal policy* to do so. How often has she given to its enemies a kingdom rebellious against herself! Bruys (a Papist by his own confession—"Notre Communion," vol. i. 108, when he wrote his Histoire des Papes) says that Italian vengeance and the *odium theologicum* concurred to produce the massacre.—Hist. des Papes, i. 372.

e Matthew, xviii. 6.

f Sueur has a very good notice of the arguments, which would whitewash the skirts of Augustine. Suppose, he says, he were dead when the

willing that all who can, should honor them for any indebtedness under which England may seem to lie to them. To me, such indebtedness becomes smaller and smaller, as I measure their motives by their manifest plan, to make England, not an independent Christian province, but a mere suburb of Papal Rome. Those who have any partiality for such an approximation, may accord Augustine and Gregory all the glory they choose; for myself, I feel more and more inclined to stand with our old British forefathers in sturdy opposition, and say, not with such auxiliaries—certainly not with such auxiliaries, metamorphosed into tyrants —do I feel as if we were called on to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. "Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis."[g] There is a help which only brings one all the nearer trouble, all the faster into the purlieus of peril and destruction. And destruction must I call all the aid which Rome has given to Christianity in England. Had British Christianity been left alone, it might have accomplished all that Augustine and his compeers did, and much more; for then, Christianity would not have exhibited itself to the Saxons as a house divided against itself—one of the worst and most disheartening advantages it ever has to encounter in the field of missionary labor. Queen Bertha, and her corps of chaplains, had evidently predisposed Kent to embrace Christianity. There was

monks of Bangor were put to the sword, the forty monks who came with him were not all gone, and they could have been accomplices in any of his schemes.—*Histoire de l'Eglise et de l'Empire*, vol. vi. pp. 9–11.

g Æneid, ii. 521.

an Archbishop of York, and an Archbishop of London, down to 586, but some ten years previous to Augustine's entrance into Canterbury. It seems to have been easy for him to hold a conference with the elder prelates of Britain, in one of the western English counties, and outside of the principality of Wales. Ireland had then prelates in it, and Scotland had then prelates in it, in communion with the Christians whom Augustine repudiated, and for whom he invoked death with all its vengeance. Ireland, and Scotland, and Wales, and Cumberland, and Cornwall, had a part in the conversion of the Saxons, which Augustine and his successors could not accomplish. Augustine's own mission failed, among the very converts whom he had boasted of by thousands,[h] and but for a wretched monkish trick, playing upon the credulity and superstition of an ignorant Saxon monarch,[i] scarce a vestige of all his panegyrized labors would have survived a quarter of a century. "Thus," as I have already said, quoting the historian Fuller, and as I say again, in his graphic words, that you may the more remember them, "thus was Kent converted to Christianity. For such as do account this a conversion of all England, to make their words good, do make use of a long and strong synechdoche, a part for the whole; far more than half the land, lying some years after, in the darkness of Paganism; which others

h Giles's Bede, ii. 191, bk ii. ch. 5, shows, that hope of the king's favor, or fear of the king's displeasure, had been the motives which converted multitudes.

i Southey's Vindiciæ, for the trick, p. 103, etc.

[not Augustine and his comrades]—*others*—afterward enlightened with the beams of the Gospel."[j]

Wherefore, I cannot call Augustine England's regenerator. He would regenerate it only at the price of unlimited subjection to a tyranny unknown to the canons of a truly Catholic council. He would have made England, what Rome is now herself, not Catholic, but uncatholic, and I might add, anti-catholic.[k] He would have eradicated its ancient Christianity, as an incumbrance and a heresy:—that very Christianity which had fought with Paganism in all its shapes—with persecution in its direst forms—with heresy under its most seducing aspects—with desertion and abandonment—till it was left as "a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city."[l] Such Christianity he would have exterminated for "another gospel," which England had finally, (I hope the figure will not be criticised, for it is scriptural[m]) to spue out of its mouth, as its sickening and cankering bane, and to protest against, with all its heart and soul, and mind and strength.

Let those to whom it is congenial, adulate Gregory and his lieutenant the monk of Italy, who would have executed any of Gregory's behests, however fatal to British independence, peace, and safety. I cannot

j Fuller, bk ii. § 13; or vol. i. 144.

k "Anti-catholic" is no new word; nor a word of Protestant excogitation. Mr. Joseph Reeve, who published his Church History in 1802, used it of the Divines of the Church of England. Romanists ought not to complain, if we imitate themselves.—See Reeve's Hist. i. 74.

l Isaiah, i. 8.

m Rev. iii. 16.

praise any one, who, for Romanism's sake, has made the British name to bear curses, British liberty to abate, and British blood to flow. I am free to say, I consider Gregory's intervention, and Augustine's descent (so unlike, so utterly unlike the fraternal visitations of the French Church, in a previous century,[n]) no blessing to our fatherland. If England could have held her own, and she might have done so, as subsequent history proved—if British Christians could have made common cause with the Irish and the Scotch, and converted the pagans, as they finally did, through a more forbidding portion of Saxon England than Augustine and his retainers succeeded in—only think what a different, what an inexpressibly different face had been put upon English history![o] Then the Pope would never have been known there, at least in the attitudes and with the claims of imperial supremacy. Then France, which has always been more or

n England has remembered French saints, and made them her own. Witness Martin and Britius, or Brice—Bishops of Tours, 145 miles south-south-west of Paris. Their names are in the English calendar for the 11th and 13th of November.

o John Johnson was stiff churchman enough, for those who delight most in ecclesiastical buckram; and yet he hesitates not to hold the following very decided position. "It had been much better [not better simply, the reader will perceive, but *much* better] if the English had received Christianity from the Britons; if it had not been below conquerors to be taught by those whom they had subdued. For they would have delivered this religion to us, without making us slaves to the Pope, whose creature Austin was."—*Vade Mecum*, 3d ed. 1709, p. 3. There, that is the language of the author of the Unbloody Sacrifice! Strong enough it is to warrant my strongest statements. And note—he refuses to call Austin a saint, and flings him off with contempt as another's tool! He justifies, too, what Churton, and churchmen like him, complain of, viz., the apparent inactivity of the Britons in converting the Saxons. How *can* you convert a man who is too proud to listen to you?

less actively jealous of Popery's taller pretensions, might have followed in her fellowship. And if so, then the Pope might never have been but the patriarch which the Council of Nice allowed him to be, as a matter of custom. Then he might never have gone higher than when the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon clipped his wings, and stopped those soaring flights by which he afterwards ascended to the pinnacle of earthly glory, and claimed to be, with Satan, a potentate for the absolute globe.

And, oh, what had been the Popedom, if England and France had never been its upholders! It might have occupied the humble position which Corinth now does; though Corinth boasts its own exalted pedigree, from St. Peter and St. Paul.[p] And with Rome, as modest and unpretending as Corinth, what a change, indescribably for the better in the annals of Europe; to say nothing at all of oriental Christendom beside! Why, what, more than Rome's insatiable and ever-meddling will, has made Europe a scene of boundless contentions? It could engender, and fight out a thirty years' war, as in the times of Gustavus Adolphus. It could curse England, and lay Venice[q] under an interdict; the freest governments which Europe ever saw. It has made all Europe sweat blood at every pore. And it still demands, that all of Europe's power and wealth, and magnificence shall be her

p Eusebius, bk ii. ch. 25.—Blunt's Lectures on the Fathers, p. 29.

q Father Paul's History of the quarrels of Pope Paul V. with the State of Venice. Translated, London, 1626.—Daunou's History of the Court of Rome, p. 221.

own, and without let or hindrance to the last jot and tittle.

Oh, I say, let those who would not have the history of Europe under Roman auspices unwritten, be numbered among England's degenerate children. I would rather have been one of the poor, but unintimidated bishops, who endured the browbeating of Augustine; I would rather have been one of the monks of Bangor, who felt the edge of Saxon steel; than a Cardinal — a Prince of the Holy Roman Empire—who yet kisses the latchet of an Italian shoe.

LECTURE V.

MEANS BY WHICH ROMANISM INTRUDED AND FASTENED ITSELF UPON THE BRITISH ISLES.—PROOF THAT IT WAS NOT THE PRINCIPAL MEANS OF CONVERTING THE PAGANS THERE, AND WAS NOT AT ALL NECESSARY FOR CONVERTING THEM.

In my last lecture on the history of the early Church of England, I brought down the sketch of events, to what may be regarded as the close of Augustine's connexion with that Church, in an hour of one of its heaviest losses and most poignant sorrow. I may regret, and I certainly do regret, the necessity which seems to associate his memory and influence with the battle of Chester and the massacre of the monks of Bangor. But the terms on which he parted from the ancient Britons — his distinct threat of deadly vengeance—of vengeance, too, from the very hands through which it was finally administered—the cold-blooded satisfaction with which Bede, his pupil and the inheritor of his spirit, mentioned the terrific catastrophe[a]—all point to but one conclusion, that

a I have shown how Bede calls the *Christian* Britons perfidious wretches, who despised salvation. Let us now see how he could speak of Ethelfrid, who, as he gloatingly says, "ravaged the Britons more than all the great men of the English." Oh, he is "a most worthy king, and ambi-

both alike approved and consented unto, what was actually done. That Augustine would have said *Amen* to that catastrophe, as Bede did, it was impossible for me to doubt.[b] Willingly, most willingly, would I exonerate him and his disciple from a dark and formidable responsibility; but the page of history should never be the page of complaisance. History is dedicated to exact justice and unwavering impartiality; and its sternest documents must be allowed to give inflexible testimony. There is a frightful consistency between the catastrophe alluded to, and the aim with which Augustine, in defiance of Catholic canons, thrust himself upon England, as its *exclusive* primate, i. e. in plain terms, with a purpose and an excogi-

tious of glory;" the only peccadillo he can be charged with, is, "he was ignorant of the true religion!"—*Bede*, bk i. ch. xxxiv. Ethelfrid, the *pagan*, is a glorious character, because he ravages the *Christian* Britons! They are impious wretches, because they would not accept the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome! This is the impartiality of one well-instructed in Italian appreciations! Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, called the same sort of people, at a later day, "obstinate fools." Examine the Latin of his conference with Colman.—*Giles's Bede*, vol. ii. p. 366. It was one of Bellarmines' solemn doctrines, that true Papists never commended the opinions or the life of a heretic or a heathen.—*De Controversiis*, vol ii. 197, a. He should have added—unless they have some Church-gain to acquire by doing so. Bellarmine forgot Bede, or he never read him.

b Geoffrey of Monmouth says, that Ethelbert incited the King of Northumberland to act as he did.—*Mason's Vindication by Lindsay*, p. 88. This reference, brought out by Archdeacon Mason, more than two hundred years ago, shows that our ancestors understood this matter, much as I have represented it. If any one wants to see Geoffrey himself, he is now easily accessible, in Bohn's Six Old English Chronicles, p. 276. Nothing is clearer than that, as Geoffrey understood the case, Augustine went back to Ethelbert in a pet, and that *his* statements provoked Ethelbert to stir up Ethelfrid the Northumbrian king. That is the plain English of the business. Augustine was too astute a Romanist to show *his own* hand. Rome knows how to pull the wires; but the hand which pulls them—catch it who can!

tated plan for its ecclesiastical subjugation.[c] Had he entered England, as the Bishops of France did, to counsel and assist—had he been such a patron of England as St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, so distinguished among the Gallican saints, whose church at Canterbury was the one he was first permitted to preach in, and whose name is still commemorated in the English calendar, for the 11th of November—had he assisted England as St. Athanasius once assisted "the interior of India," without claiming jurisdiction over it, as the reward of his patriarchal action[d]—had he taught the Saxons, "that if they intended to embrace the Christian faith in sincerity, and to any purpose, they

c "When the same Gregory sent Augustine, or Austin the abbot, on a mission to England, to convert the Pagan Saxons to the Christian faith, he gave him a *further* commission, to reduce the British Church to a conformity with the Roman, in the time of celebrating Easter, and in their mode of tonsure, and to *submit* themselves to the *Primacy* of the Pope of Rome."—*Hales's Primitive Church of the Bitish Isles*, p. 211. The Romish historians, when anxious to show how *lenient* Augustine was, suppress the idea that he insisted on the Papal Supremacy. When anxious to show how *orthodox* he was, and how his notions resembled present Romish notions, *then* they even contend he taught it.—*Alban Butler's Saints*, new ed. i. 687, note. This is their usual consistency, and just what we might expect.

d Socrates, bk i. ch. 19.—Sozomen, bk ii. ch. 24.—Theodoret, bk i. ch. 23. All three relate it; yet not one gives us a hint of Athanasius's setting up a claim, *more Gregorii*, as he well might. Blondel quotes this act of Athanasius, and a similiar one of Chrysostom and others, to the same effect.—De la Primauté, pp. 304, 305. This book is a perfect mine of authorities, on questions about the Papal Supremacy. It is a folio of nearly 1300 pages, and is often quoted by Tillemont. I can even remember his arraying Petavius and Blondel against Baronius, in his *Arians*. Note 55, p. 546, Deacon's ed. In 1641, when the Long Parliament and the Westminster Assembly were trying to batter down the monarchy, and the Church of England, he (Blondel) dedicated his book, in most respectful and cordial terms to Charles I. Oh, that all Presbyterians had been more like Blondel!

should restore the sceptre of Britain to the right lords and owners, who had hired them for their service and defence, from whom, on the contrary, they wrested it by force and perjury, against the faith and honor of soldiers"[e]: had he behaved in this manner, then England might have hailed his coming as a blessing, and a blessing only. Then Christianity—not appearing to the Saxons as a scheme for extending jurisdictions, or upbuilding principalities, or as a house divided against itself—might have made truer and surer progress than it did under his boasted auspices. Then England—down to this distant day—might never have had but one Lord, one faith, one baptism; and never have tolerated or abetted any system, but that "once delivered to the Saints."

And in view of such a possibility, such a transcendently blessed possibility, I could not help esteeming Augustine's mission to England, which had counteracted and prevented it forever, no benediction, no acquisition, but a let, a hindrance, and a detriment.[f] It

e Jones's British Church, p. 224. Jones's book is scarce, and not as readable as it might be. But it contains weighty suggestions, as the quotation shows. Would that some modern scholar would work it up into a popular form. It was published in London in 1678; and is one of that series of books produced in the grand controversy, then carried on, with the Church of Rome.

f "The greater unanimity, which would have resulted to the British Christians, from the non-arrival of Augustine with the *novelties* of the Roman worship, would probably have more speedily effected the conversion of the Saxons."—*Townsend's Ecclesiastical and Civil History Philosophically Considered*, vol. ii. p. 9. Dr. Lappenberg, with the forecast of a religious philosopher, tells us, that the British Church "appeared, no less by its geographical position, than by its exalted spiritual endowments, fitted to become the foundation of a Northern Patriarchate," to be a "counterpoise to Rome and the rest of the South," and to take a

will now be my business to carry out and further illustrate this leading idea, by showing you that Augustine's own mission (as was hinted in the last lecture) became itself a failure—as revived and prolonged by means that any honest and candid mind ought to have been thoroughly ashamed of—and that, when perpetuated, it did not, after all, accomplish more, towards the conversion of the Saxons, than did the efforts of others—others, too, whom he had repudiated as "despisers of salvation,"[g] and given over (Inquisition-like) to "the vengeance of death," from the hands of those who wielded the strong arm of military power.

Augustine may have died, when he had not long enjoyed his coveted superiority over "all the bishops of Britain."[h] He is said to have died somewhere between A. D. 604, and A. D. 611.[i] King Ethelbert, (of course a Romish saint,) his new patron, is said to have survived till 616; and while he lived, Christianity was not only tolerated, but encouraged, at the royal courts; though, probably, not upon the four-cornered platform of Gregory for church-extension, viz.: exhortation, flattery, terror, and punishment.[j]

proper "guardianship over a Celtic and Germanic population." Even a Pope, Urban II., had a glimpse of this propriety, when he called Anselm, *papa alterius orbis*, pope of the other world; and most happy might it have been, had a patriarchate been erected in Britain, by Constantine the Great. For the reference to *Lappenberg's Anglo-Saxon England*, see vol. i. p. 134.

g For other abusive epithets, bestowed on the impracticable Protestantism, or anti-Romanism, of the old Britons, see *Collin's Perranzabuloe*, p. 16, 4th ed.

h Giles's Bede, ii. 19.

i Mason's Vindication, p. 90.

j Giles's Bede, ii. 148.

Ethelbert, under the mild persuasions of his good Queen Bertha, had set his face like a flint against Rome's favorite resort to a system of compulsions; and how far Augustine and his associates succeeded, by employing gentler instrumentalities, remains now to be seen.[k] Ethelbert died in 616; and though we hear of Augustine's achievements, as so wondrous that he baptized thousands in a day, all the eulogy which Bede himself can bestow upon his "new Church," (as Bede's translator improperly renders his words,[l]) is, to compare that Church to little tender shoots, just peeping above the soil, and beginning fairly to grow. He did not convert Ethelbert's successor and son. On the contrary, the moment his father was safely deposited in his sepulchre, the new king openly professed the old idolatry; and the thousands who had imitated his father, (through the hollow motives of fear or favor, as Bede distinctly admits,) fell away with him, and relapsed, as completely as if Christianity had never been introduced among them.[m] Nay more, Augustine's labors among the East Saxons, (to whom he had dispatched a bishop,) seem to have been no more permanently efficacious, than among the Saxons of Kent.

k Dr. Lingard would fain have it, that this mercy came from the Pope, and not from Queen Bertha.—*Anglo-Saxons*, p. 13. But Gregory's letter is somewhat better testimony than Dr. Lingard's conjectures. Rome is willing enough to *begin* with exhortation; but the luckless wight who will not listen implicitly, will always be sure to find punishment close the scene. At least, if it does not, the fault will not be in Rome's want of disposition to inflict it, in the most smarting forms.

l Bede, bk ii. ch. 5; Giles's Bede, ii. 191.

m Bede, bk ii. ch. 5; Giles's Bede, ii. 191. Reeve, in his *Ch. Hist.* ii. 355, contrives to ignore all this; while he glorifies Augustine's conversions, which terminated in (if one may say so) disconversion.

No sooner had the king of *these* Saxons died, than *his* sons, too, relapsed, like the son of King Ethelbert, and absolutely drove away the prelate whom Augustine had planted by their sides, as his co-worker and suffragan. This bishop, with a similar one, thrust by him into the old British archbishopric of London, forsook the country as lost to Christianity, and hurrying across the Straits of Dover, took refuge in France as their only possible religious shelter. Thither Augustine's successor was about to follow—at least, had made apparent preparation to do so; but, knowing the species of monarch with whom he had to deal, contrived to keep his place, with all its revenues fortified by that famous law of Rome, which made it such a foremost of felonies to steal any thing from the clergy.[n] The unworthy means to which he resorted for this much-wished-for end, it is now my duty to relate.[o] He slept one night in his church, where no curious sceptical eye could watch him; and came the next morning, with his back all lacerated with stripes, into the presence of his royal master. With heroic gravity he deliberately informed him, that St. Peter had stolen an hour from Paradise, to come and chastise him in that shameful and horrible manner, for his

n Giles's Bede, vol. ii. 189.—The origin, probably, of mortmains. *Ridley's View of Ecclesiastical and Civil Law*, 2d ed. p. 182, etc.

o Bede, bk ii. ch. 6, contains the story. But even William of Malmsbury covers it with euphemisms. He says, Lawrence "was meditating his own departure; but, having received chastisement from God, he was induced to change his resolution."—*Malmsbury's Chronicle*, Bohn's ed. p. 13. Lappenberg is so ashamed of the story, that he will not repeat it.—*Anglo-Saxons*, vol. i. p. 143. His translator has to produce it in a note.

cowardly and traitorous design of forsaking the flock, (which he, *i. e.*, Peter, had committed to him,) and leaving the soul of his king uncared for. Shallow indeed must have been the discernment of a crowned head which could not fathom a trick so palpable; yet we know that Pagan superstition, like Romish superstition, is boundless in its credulity. The artifice, sealed with blood, prevailed—as Dr. Lingard somewhat pertinaciously maintains, though he takes a care, somewhat amusing to a Protestant eye, *not* to tell us whether he himself accredited its miraculous pretensions. The blunt Mr. Reeve has not Dr. Lingard's ingenuity; and his safety consists in ignoring the story altogether.*p*

Such a pitiful subterfuge as this—a transaction professedly dated at the dead of night, without one critical eye to scrutinize it, without a witness to verify it beside its own most deeply interested narrator—is made the foundation of the Most Reverend Augustine's "new Church," and the permanent beginning of Romanism in England! Mark it, and remember it well. Romanism perished in England when it was prohibited from adopting and carrying out its darling system of compulsion. Then, all the glory of its conversions—like the beauty of Jonah's gourd—vanished with fell rapidity. But the moment it could give fair swing to its inherent proclivities for superstition, and govern others through a similar peculiarity, *that* moment it began to revive and flourish in a style congenial to its

p Lingard's Anglo-Saxon Ch. 2d ed. p. 15; Reeve's Ch. Hist. i. 355; Southey's Vindiciæ, p. 102, etc.

heart! The king who beheld the scars, (for scars some call them[q]—and, perhaps, after all, the subject of them had acquired said scars in other days, and not in the most honorable manner,) of St. Peter's corded whip upon the back of an Italian Archbishop of Canterbury —that king, we are told, became a convert to Christianity more speedily, and with vastly less hesitation than the one who first encountered Italian missionaries on the island of Thanet, and gave them but a cautious and indifferent welcome.[r]

Wherefore, the genuine inauguration of Latin Christianity in England must be dated from a sound flogging by St. Peter, inflicted at midnight, with no irreverent eye to scan the mysterious ministration. Worthy origin of the system which it was presumed to vindicate; and let all who choose to bend the knee to Rome, for her agency in the conversion of England, never forget the crowning weapon of her longest and best success.[s] If her system ever flagellates themselves, they will not think it unnatural that a resort should, occasionally, be made to instrumentalities which kept a recreant Archbishop of Canterbury safely at home, and caused the system he represented to settle down, like an incubus, on the very bosom of Britain.[t]

q Lingard says, "marks." Giles's Bede and Bohn's Bede, "scars."

r This king, "who had been upon the point of driving them all away, was complimented by the Sovereign Pontiff, upon the purity of his belief and the perfection of his Christian works."—*Thierry*, i. 41. *Henry of Huntingdon's Chronicle*, Bohn's edit. p. 86.

s "To assert a false miracle, is nothing less, according to St. Paul, than to bear false witness against God; as has been remarked by that exceedingly judicious saint, Peter Damian."—*Fleury's Eccl. Hist.* vol. xiii. p. 3.

t And, notwithstanding, idolatry gave way latest, in the very scene

And here, perhaps, as I have alluded to the chief commencement of that series of frauds, impostures and untiring deceptions, by which Latin Christianity was fastened upon England, and made to grapple to it like barnacles to a vessel's planking; it may be as well for me to turn aside and show (to some extent) how faithfully the example of Augustine's successors was followed up and out, in accordance with a theory which Rome has latterly endorsed with eagerness—the theory (so called) of ecclesiastical development.

The example of Laurentius, the next Archbishop of Canterbury after Augustine—if Augustine himself was not the beginner of imposture[u]—was pursued into almost every species of delusion which human ingenuity could conceive of, and human audacity palm off. The invisible world furnished, of course, a boundless field to range in; and if our modern spiritualists desired a papal precedent for their wildest whimseys, they could plead it from the instances which the century following Laurentius supplied, in plenary abundance.[v] Of these, I will quote a sample, by which you can judge for yourselves, whether any fanatic of our

of Augustine's labors. "The Anglo-Saxons who *latest* retained their ancient worship, were those of the *southern* coasts."—*Thierry*, vol. i. p. 45.

u Augustine's Miracle, to astound the Britons, (opening a supposed blind man's eyes,) was performed, as Bede *incautiously* tells us, upon an Anglo-Saxon. No wonder the poor Britons could not work upon *such* materials.—*Giles's Bede*, ii. 173, 175. *Soame's Anglo-Saxon Church*, 4th edit. p. 57. Dr. Lingard, in guarded terms, merely says, "a miracle *is said* to have subdued their obstinacy."—*Anglo-Saxons*, p. 47. The doctor saw the leak in Bede's statement.

v "By setting forth opinions such as these, this austere and wild enthusiast (Francis of Assisi) acquired many followers belonging to the

own age could desire a wider scope for his roving, craving and teeming imagination. The personage whom I am about to quote, was no common, vulgar, uneducated stroller, who addressed the rabble in the streets, or the half-drunk listeners of an ale-house. He was a sort of conscience-keeper to a king, and, of course, is an instance to exhibit the coin which popery passed current among the loftiest of any land, which it called peculiarly its own.

"He related," after an excursion to the world of souls, "that one of a shining countenance, and attired in shining garments, guided him, when he was dead, towards the quarter where the sun rises in midsummer. They walked together, in silence, till they came to a place where was, on the left, a valley of great width and depth, and which seemed to be infinitely long. On one side of this valley there were raging flames, and on the other cold blasts, not less violent, driving hail and snow before them; and both the burning and the frozen regions were full of human souls, who, as if seeking relief which it was not possible to find, rushed to and fro, from the fire into the frost, and

Franciscan tribe, who were afterwards called *Spiritualists*."—*Grier's Epitome of the Councils*, p. 207. So the very name of Spiritualism, as well as the thing, turns out to be Romish. I have no desire to depreciate Quakers, for their blood flows in my veins, and I love and esteem many of their fraternity, yet it is perhaps due to historical truth to say, that the Jesuits have even boasted of having invented their views. It is clear that their opposition to oaths, sacraments, etc., would enable the Jesuits to avoid tests, and to work more comfortably under their cover. "A St. Omer's Jesuit," says Mr. Ware, in a very curious work, "declared that they were twenty years hammering out the sect of the Quakers."— *Ware's Foxes and Firebrands*, 2d edit. vol. i. part i. p. 7, Dublin, 1682. Compare *Clarke on the Royal and Papal Supremacy*, London, 1809, p. 323.

from the frost into the fire, either torment being alike insupportable. They were so hideously deformed, and their punishment visibly so dreadful, that he supposed these must be the places appointed for the damned; but his conductor, who saw his very thoughts, answered him and said, 'No, this is not Hell, as thou supposest.'

"They proceeded, till the region, growing more and more obscure, became so utterly dark at last, that he could distinguish nothing except the shape of the lucid garments of his guide. Suddenly they came upon a deep pit, from whence globes of fire arose without intermission into the air, and fell again into the abyss out of which they were exploded. There, to his unutterable horror, his conductor disappeared, leaving him, as it seemed, to his fate. And now he could distinguish that these fiery globes were full of human souls, which, like sparks carried up with the smoke, were borne aloft, and then, as if caught in an eddy of vapor, were resorbed into the pit; and the stench which issued with the vapor, an inexpressible, incomparable, unimaginable stench . . . . filled that whole place of darkness. The poor Northumbrian's soul stood trembling, at all this, as well it might: afraid to remain where it was, and yet more afraid to move, and not knowing what would be the end. Presently, he heard behind him a sound, as of persons piteously lamenting their miserable fate, mingled with loud shouts of brutal mocking, like the uproar of a rabble rejoicing over their captured enemies. Among these souls, who were thus being hurried to the place

of bale, he perceived one that was shaven and shorn, a layman's and a woman's. He saw them plunged into the pit, their conductor plunging with them; and he heard their cries, and the laughter of the fiends, growing fainter and fainter as they sunk, till the sounds were lost in the confused and promiscuous roar which ascended."[w]—I could quote pages of such matter, by the score; probably this specimen will suffice, and so I will only subjoin, that there are no parallels to such stuff but in Virgil's account of the visit of his hero to Erebus and Elysium; or, in the pretended flights of our modern spiritualists, into those shadowy realms which lie beyond time's horizon.

As to pretended Romish miracles, wrought not upon such coarse materials as this world supplies, I could not perhaps select a more striking, or a more familiar instance, than Dunstan's seizure of Satan with a pair of red-hot pinchers. This is so outrageously ridiculous that modern Romish writers are fain to let it slip, as a mere chimera of old monkish brains, befogging themselves, as well as befogging others. They would gladly bury it in dusty death, amid the forlorn rubbish of profound oblivion. But the simple fact is, that the most intellectual of the Romish orders—even that of the Jesuits—adopted it, wreathed it into poetry, and employed that poetry, as our forefathers employed the dialogue of the New England primer, between Christ, a youth, and the devil, for the edification of

w Southey's accounts of St. Drithelm, and Alfred the Wise, King of Northumberland.—*Vindiciæ*, p. 176, etc.

the rising generation, and that, down to times quite recent.[x]

The Jesuits, with all their sagacity, and all their uncalculating devotion to the Romish Supremacy, can have but a poor opinion of even Romanized human nature. Their works of piety (I mean of that description which comes, *with us*, under the denomination of works of practical piety—those which compare with "Jeremy Taylor's Holy Living and Dying," and "Doddridge's Rise and Progress,") abound, to repletion, with matters not more creditable, or credible by others, than Virgil's romance of a journey to the Stygian Shades. A celebrated member of the tribe composed a work, not so old as Taylor's Living and Dying, (which were published in 1650 and 1651,) and which he styled the "Itinerary to Heaven." This work is pronounced by Mr. Southey, who was familiar with the tongue in which it is composed, as "filled with fables, some of them as absurd and grotesque, as others are revolting for their grossness and monstrosity."[y] And, lest we should imagine that a mere private judgment was responsible for such a production, and that the Latin Church might repudiate it with that adroitness with which it sometimes staves off uncomfortable testimony, Mr. Southey takes a laudable pains to inform us, that it was solemnly licensed as "well worthy to be published for the general good"—that its author held a high office in the Supreme Council of the Inquisition—and that to have expressed a disbelief in

x Southey's Vindiciæ, p. 264.

y Vindiciæ, p. 273.

its thousand and one tales, might have cost an adventurous doubter his very life!

Such, then, appears to have been a large, a sanctioned, and a most gainful portion of the agency[z] employed by the Latin Church during the middle ages, when it was acquiring its highest influence, and most potential sway in our paternal land—sustaining Saxon interlopers in their expulsion of the Britons—eradicating ancient, independent British Christianity; and substituting something of its own, fresh from Italy, and bearing the fond impress of an Italian pontiff. The stories of Latin Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England, remind a scholar inevitably of the stories in Livy, respecting the priesthood of Pagan Rome. They almost seem Livy's worn-out tales, re-edited and re-echoed under a new nomenclature. Chemically, (as a philosopher might say, and in more senses than one,) they are singular parallels. The frequent speaking of an ox, *e. g.*, tallies strangely with Dunstan's (I cannot say *St.* Dunstan;[a] nor can the Church of England, though she gives him an inferior place in her calendar),[b] speaking

z And these pretended miracles have not ceased. They were attempted, but with equivocal success, when the French Republicans were troubling Italy, towards the close of the eighteenth century. "It is remarkable, that it was always *before* the entrance, or *after* the departure of the French troops, that the miracles took place. While Tuscany was in the possession of the Republicans, the laws of nature were carefully respected by the saints, and by the souls of the other world."—*Memoirs of Scipio de Ricci*, Roscoe's ed. vol. ii. p. 154.

a Alluding to Dunstan, Bp. Cosin says, pretty expressively, "After his death he was sainted, but God knows why."—*Cosin's Works*, new ed. v. p. 31.

b May 19. On Monday, 26 and 27, she commemorates Augustine and Bede; but does not call *either of them* a saint. She commemorates Alban, June 17, and *him* she does, as she well may, call a saint.

crucifix; and the speech was accomplished doubtless, in both cases, by the gifts and arts of ventriloquism.[c]

The machinery by which Latin Christianity ascended in reputation and magnified its power in England, need not longer detain us. I will now return to Laurentius (Augustine's successor in the Archbishopric of Canterbury), and let you know he was a devoted pupil of his master, in his endeavors to vanquish the opposition of the British bishops to the papal supremacy. When he had fortified himself with a couple of suffragans, he, with those suffragans, addressed an epistle to *all* the prelates of Scotia (as Ireland was called at that time, and for a long period subsequently),[d] to induce them to yield him that deference which had been vainly solicited from the Bishops of Wales and its neighborhood; and for their obstinacy about which their brother ecclesiastics paid the tremendous penalty of an ante-dated death. He failed; nay, he more than failed.[e] He was, as we might now say, snubbed with a curtness at which we may express profound astonishment. The prelates in question not improbably sent representatives to Canterbury, to confer with him; one of whom was a bishop, whose example was, of course, worthy special observation. This bishop

c Southey's Vindiciæ, p. 258. Fuller, i. 349. "As he advanced in years, a harp which hung on a peg, without any human touch, played the sweet melody of the antiphone, Gaudent in cælis."—*Roger of Wendover*, Bohn's ed. i. p. 270.

d Bede admits this. "The Scots who inhabit the island of Ireland, which is next to Britain."—Giles's Bede, ii. 183. "From the fourth century to the eleventh, [three hundred to one thousand] the names *Scotia* and *Scoti* belong solely to Ireland and the Irish."—Pinkerton's Scotland, new ed. 1814, ii. 58.

e Giles's Bede, ii. 185.

not only refused point-blank to acknowledge Laurentius as his superior: he would not treat him as a bare equal. He would not eat with him at the same table, or under the same roof; but conferred with him as an alien and a stranger—as an intruder, not to say a downright usurper. Now this bishop was a descendant from, and an inheritor of, the episcopate of St. Patrick in Ireland. He was, of course, acting as a representative of the ancient Irish Church; and here, then, comes out the singular, incidental issue, that the primitive Irish Church and the primitive English Church sympathized most cordially and affectionately, and were alike ignorant of, and opposed to, all dictation from the see of Rome.*f*

f I cannot have a better authority for these statements than in Mr. Newman's life (by authorship or adoption) of Wilfrid, Abp of York, A. D. 709. The *then* temper of Mr. Newman towards the Church of England, whose bread he was eating, is very obvious; since, in this very life, he styles Cardinal Pole the *last* Catholic primate of England. He could not have offered his mother Church a more studied insult. Nevertheless, in Wilfred's life we have this ample testimony to the condition of the Irish Church at the times of which I was speaking. "In fact, Ireland was a great centre of civilization, and its temper was vehemently opposed to that of Rome. In many little ways we may trace the Celtic spirit growing and pushing forward, disclosing itself more and more, getting consistency through an increasing consciousness of its own strength, until a schism seemed actually threatening. It pleased God, of his mercy, to interpose. The Roman mission of St. Gregory to the Saxons appears, in this point of view, like an inspiration." And, again, in language of still more decisive tenor. "It is not too much to say, that through the influence of the Scottish Church, and of the Celtic civilization, of which Ireland was the centre, Christendom approached to the very verge of a tremendous schism; almost reaching, in extent, to the unhappy sacrilege of the sixteenth century." Here, then, we have the frank confession of J. H. Newman, *et ejus contubernales*, that if Augustine had not landed in Thanet, in the sixth century, the Reformation might have come a thousand years sooner! I do not envy the mental or moral condition of that Protestant, who, in view of such a confession, can be Augustine's panegyrist or admirer. For the passages quoted, see *Life of Wilfrid*, pp. 24, 25. London, 1844.

Observe this carefully, and remember it for all time to come, of your mortal lives. The primitive Church of Ireland was Protestant, as well as the primitive Church of England—and, what is profoundly curious, continued so longer and more pertinaciously than its sister—be the issue *now* never so dissimilar. The ancient Church of Ireland believed in its own ecclesiastical independence with an exclusiveness which is more than Protestant—understanding Protestantism as now exemplified. For who, now, would refuse to eat under the same roof, or at the same table, with a Papist, or even refuse to pray with him? though that is a concession he has been known to refuse, utterly, to ourselves—even so far as to refuse to say with us the short prayer of our Redeemer's own self.[g] I need scarcely add, that this consummate intolerance reaches, so far as it can be made to do so, beyond the grave, since the very bones of a Papist may not be permitted to lie with ours in the same sep-

g Such is Dr. Townsend's testimony, in his Journal of a Tour in Italy, in 1850, p. 241. Dr. Townsend well observes, that this was the answer of Mary Queen of Scots, to the offer of prayer at her execution. So said Priest Jarvis at *his*. "I want not the prayers of heretics."—*Challoner's Missionary Priests*, part ii. p. 16. How different from such conduct that of Prof. Tamburini, of Pavia, who would not call any man a heretic that would not receive Rome's decrees, because he did not esteem them a judgment of the Church in its entirety; its Catholicity in its genuine sense, and not in its restricted sense, as employed by divines of an ultra-Roman school.—*Tamburini's Prælectiones*, vol. iii. p. 209. Archbishop Parker's profession of faith, in his last will, was as follows: "I profess, that I do certainly believe and hold, whatsoever the Holy Catholic Church believeth and receiveth in any articles whatsoever, pertaining to faith, hope and charity, in the whole Sacred Scripture."—From *Hardwick on the Articles*, p. 117, Eng. ed. The man who can pronounce him a heretic, who could hold to such a declaration, must have graduated in the hardening school of Pharaoh, King of Egypt, and been senior wrangler, too.

ulchre or cemetery. Yet the ancient Protestantism of Ireland—the Protestantism of the disciples of St. Patrick—was, at the time I speak of, quite as extreme and unenduring towards Italian Christianity and its satellites. It prolonged that opposition with Hibernian zeal. The ancient Church of Ireland never allowed an archbishop to receive a pall from Rome till A. D. 1151, while England had been subjugated, ecclesiastically, long before.[h] History brings out marvelous developments; and few are more singular than the fact, that Ireland, how devoted soever at present to Popery, was *once* its opponent, over, and beyond, and above England, be England never so anti-Papal now.[i]

Laurentius, having failed with Ireland, tried Augustine's experiment a second time in England;[j] but a second time met with Augustine's merited rebuff. No resource remained for him but the experiments of

h Wordsworth's Sermons, 4th series, p. 94. Inett's Origines, new edit. vol. ii. pt i. pp. 293–294. Abp Usher tells us, that it was about this time, that the Pope got his first penny of tribute out of the Irish. They called it Smoke-silver, as it was a penny for each domestic hearth.—*Religion of the Anc. Irish*, chap. xi. We here see what Rome paid in return for solid coin.

i And, yet, this is the character of Ireland, when anti-papal. "From the fifth to the eighth century, Ireland became the teacher of Europe, and sent forth those illustrious sages, whose names illuminate the dark night of ignorance and barbarism."—*Celtic Records of Ireland*, Dublin, 1852, p. 19. Ireland was thus glorious and useful, when she had no communion with Rome. Under Romish subjection, she has become, morally and ecclesiastically, like one of her own bogs. And when she has sometimes proved a troublesome pupil, even for Rome, then Rome has been as ready to curse her, as any one else. Who can forget the Spaniard's bitter taunt—"Christ did not die for the Irish."—*Phelan's Church of Rome in Ireland*, p. 249.

j Giles's Bede, ii. 185; or, bk ii. ch. 4.

superstition; and they (alas for human nature!) *they* amply availed him. His pretended stripes from St. Peter were sharp arguments with a mind besotted by superstition—they awoke its most haunting apprehensions—and the King of the Saxons yielded, when all the arrogancy of Papal impertinence passed, with the old British, and the old Irish, for mere vaporing, which they regarded not more than the whistling of the wind, or the roaring of their iron-bound shores.

These things took place, according to Bede, in, say A. D. 610; and, about a hundred years later, as he is constrained to admit, "a notable book" had to be written,[k] echoing the strain of Augustine and Lawrence, who would have had all England, and all Ireland, too, prostrate at their feet. Even that met with but partial success; and the historian acknowledges, that the differences between the ancient Britains and the novelties of Rome, had, if any thing, become multiplied and magnified. Augustine told the British bishops, at the opening of his conference with them, that there were *many* differences between them and himself. Bede, who understood the case more fully, or was less complaisant, said those differences were *very many.*[l] The writer of 705 calls them *perplura;*

k Aldhelm about Easter.—Bede, bk v. ch. 18; Giles's ed. vol. iii. 235; Giles's Aldhelm, pp. xx. 83. Bede's "notable book" is a letter of some half a dozen pages. But then it defends a peculiarity of Rome, and so it is *egregium.* Had it questioned such a peculiarity, it would have been *perfidum, nefandum, obstinationis stultus labor!* These are the abusive epithets which Bede and Wilfrid resorted to, against dissenters from *their* notions.—Giles's Bede, ii. pp. 178, 366.

l *Multis* is Augustine's word; *Plurima* is Bede's word. Giles's Bede, ii. p. 176, and p. 172.

that is, as we might express it now, *more than a few.* It is quite likely, that his unusual double comparative is an abbreviation for the more common double superlative, *perplurima;* or, *very many more than a few.*[m]

Now, this ecclesiastical diversity and antagonism was no bad state of things, if France had only held out as sturdily, and the political power of the Pope had not enabled him to give augmented energy to his spiritual mandates. But the sovereigns of France, and the Saxon sovereigns of England, all found it expedient, if not necessary, to propitiate the (so called) servant of servants—as European monarchs now do, who sit uneasily upon doubtful thrones. The Popes, imitating Gregory in mock humility and grasping ambition, generally contrived to gain more than they imparted; and the day, in due time, came, when primitive Protestantism, in its loneliness and poverty, could not withstand the united puissance of the purse, the crosier, and the sword. Scanty treasuries and rich oppression; want, war, and worldly temptations; were too mighty for the comparatively few and feeble representatives of ancient Christianity in Britain to contend against. Yet they did contend, almost against hope; nor was it till the *eleventh century* that the Church of Llandaff yielded to the tide of merciless invasion, and became the see of a Roman bishop.[n]

m Faber, in his Thesaurus, ii. col. 259, quotes *perplures* from Pliny; but says it is a reading objected to by very many.

n Archdeacon Williams's invaluable little book, "The Church of England independent of the Church of Rome, in all Ages," London, W. E. Painter's edition, without date, p. 50. "No acknowledgment of the English Primate on the part of the Welsh took place previously to the con-

This was the first Church, as we are assured, of any note in Wales, which fell into Romish hands—it bowed to its fate, as we are also assured, only after a tedious struggle with carnage and desolation.[o] So you may perceive it was not till 500 years after its first demand for submission, that the Papal Supremacy achieved a long-coveted triumph, and old genuinely Catholic Cambria began to succumb to its dictations. Much, much do I fear, my Brethren, that we of this generation and our descendants, (if they, like us, are to be governed by expediency, and not by conscience; by policy, and not by old-fashioned law), might not have held out half the time. Let us think no scorn of them, but rather pray that more of their spirit may revive among, and animate, their children of this distant age.[p] Popery may be a hard opponent,

quest of the country by the English, under the Norman dynasty."—*Lappenberg's Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. i. p. 194. "The first legate that ever appeared in Scotand, was John of Crema, in the year 1125, before which time there is no trace to be met with of any Papal authority in this country."—*C. J. Lyon, History of St. Andrews*, Edinburgh, 1838, p. 16.

o His Welsh neighbors were thus nobly characterized by Henry II.—"The Welsh nation is so adventurous, that they dare encounter naked with armed men, ready to spend their blood for their country, and pawn their life for praise."—Heylyn's Cosmographie, 2d edition, p. 329. It was not strange that such a people should resolve, that they would never be subjugated. "Never," exclaim their old poets, "no, never shall the Kymri [the Cambrians] pay tribute; they will fight till death for the possession of the lands bathed by the Wye."—Thierry, i. 51. This was the spirit of *our* forefathers in 1776; and Great Britain ought to have remembered its origin, and respected it.

p A maxim of the ancient Welsh was, "Truth against the world;" which represents the spirit contained in the ecclesiastical adage, "Athanasius contra mundum." The ancient Britons had the spirit of Athanasius, and, as themselves said, nothing but treachery could vanquish them. Indeed, when downtrodden, this was their confident tone to an oppressor, "Do thy worst: thou canst not destroy our name or our lan-

but the temper of ancient England, and ancient Ireland, too, inspiring those who do it battle, will shatter its puissance, and lay its honors in the dust.

Before this lecture closes, another topic remains to be noticed, though in a somewhat cursory manner. You have seen how the mission of Augustine was likely to die out, and the character of the instrumentalities which saved it from annihilation, and rendered it ultimately, (though at long and tedious cost,) what the Latin Church denominates, a triumph.[q] It would not be difficult to prove that England was never more than half converted to modern Popery, as well as France[r]—where, to this day, the Council of Trent has never been recognized in all its fulness. But that is not my object. I have more than once hinted, that enough of Christianity, and of Christian organization, and Christian temper, remained in Britain and its dependencies, to have converted the Saxons, if Augustine and his immediate associates had departed—as they all but did do—and, moreover, one and all of them.[s]

guage."—For all these statements, see *Williams's Antiquities of the Cymry*, p. 16; *Probert's Welsh Laws*, p. 385; *Thierry's Conquest*, vol. i. 53.

q The Saxons rebelled, just like the Britons.—Thierry, i. 50.

r Ch. Butler, Esq., on Creeds, p. 11; Du Pin's Study of Theology, p. 317, ed. 1720; Hales's Prim. Ch. of the British Isles; his Analysis from Government Documents of checks upon the Romish Church in Europe. France, pp. 303–313.

s "The Romanists boast of the great success of Austin in converting the Pagan Saxons to Christianity, for which he was rewarded with the see of Canterbury; but the principal merit of their conversion is due to the zealous labors of Irish missionaries."—*Hales's Prim. Ch. of the British Isles*, p. 221. Bede confessed as much.—*Soames's Anglo-Saxon Ch.* 4th ed. p. 92. We have already seen that, at this time, the Irish, as Mr. Newman was forced to admit, were not opposed merely to Rome, but

I brought up, but a short time since, the fact that (at the time of Augustine's arrival in England) Ireland had an abundance of Christians, and of Christian ministers within it, who sympathized entirely with the ancient British Church—repudiated the new Church of Rome—and would gladly have united with their brethren, in establishing and promoting missions for the conversion of unbelievers. "It is surprisingly strange," says Mr. Rapin, in his reflections on the primitive state of the English Church, at the close of the third book of his history, "that the conversion of the English should be ascribed to Austin,[t] rather than to Aidan,[u] to Finan, to Colman, to Cedd, to Diuma, and the other Scotch monks, who undoubtedly labored much more abundantly than he. But here lies the case. These last had not their or-

"vehemently opposed" to her. Nevertheless, this is the style in which the entire labors of the British, and Irish too, are as sturdily ignored, as if Britons and Hibernians were all Pagans together. "From Kent, where it was first planted, that Divine symbol [the cross—unknown there, of course, before!] continued to advance from kingdom to kingdom, until the entire of the English, princes and people, were converted after the innumerable hardships, labors, and trying sacrifices of ninety years."—*Miley's Rome under Paganism and the Popes*, vol. ii. p. 235. This is a tolerable specimen of an *Io triumphe* upon a Romish trumpet.

t Austin for Augustine, sometimes, to distinguish him from the renowned Bp of Hippo—a *genuine* saint.

u Aidan.—"Immense numbers of Anglo-Saxons were instructed in the doctrines of Christianity, by this Irish saint; under whose direction was founded the famous Abbey of Melrose, whose 'ruins grey' form the theme of The Lay of the Last Minstrel."—*Celtic Records of Ireland*, Dublin, 1852, p. 20. "Germany was especially indebted to British ecclesiastics, whether of kindred or of Celtic race, both for its Christianity and its early mental formation."—*Lappenberg's Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. i. p. 184. "Few are aware how much, under God, our country [Scotland] is indebted to the pious labors of these men."—*C. J. Lyon's History of St. Andrews*, Edinburgh, 1828, p. 17, note.

ders from Rome, and therefore must not be allowed any share in the glory of their work."[v] Mr. Rapin has touched the core of the matter, and dissected it out with anatomical precision. "Piety towards Rome," as an historian has aptly characterized it[w]—that it is which brings "distinguished consideration" upon such emperors as Phocas, such empresses as Irene, such monastics as Egbert, such an order as the Jesuits, such a court as the Inquisition, such plots as Guy Fawkes's, such assassinations as Ravillac's, such massacres as those of Bangor and St. Bartholomew; and, finally, upon such intrusive and subjugating missions as those of the first Latin Archbishop of Canterbury. But hope must not quite desert us; though, as De Maistre puts it, no man of honor can be other than a Papist, and we consign ourselves to infamy by detracting from Roman fame. A well-known controversialist, one who entered the lists fearlessly with such a champion as Dr. Lingard, does not hesitate to affirm that no denial can be attempted of the fact, "that native missionaries, and not Roman ones, converted most of our Saxon forefathers to Christianity."[x]

I will now show you something of the missionary instrumentalities with which the ancient British Church, and its sisters in Scotland and Ireland, might have worked, and did work; and how it never fell to *their* lot to despair of their charge as hopeless,

v Tindal's Rapin, 4th ed. i. 279.

w Foulke's Manual, pp. 265, 220. For Egbert, Rapin, i. 282, 283.

x Soames's Latin Ch. p. 45; so Inett, Origines, i. 72, new ed.; Hales's Anc. Ch. of the British Isles, p. 221; Abp Usher's Religion of the Ancient Irish, ch. x.

as it did to the contemporaries of Augustine—and that it was never considered by them a permission, if not a duty, to resort, in moments of failure, to the machinations of fraud, imposture, and systematized deception.

The ancient Welsh Church had a theological institute at Bangor, in Flintshire, of prodigious size and capabilities, as hints already given have exhibited. It could afford to lose one thousand two hundred of its inmates in a day, by the sword of ruthless war; yet it survived, and flourished, and wrought on, unintimidated, scattering far and wide the seeds of charity and mercy for many a long year to come. St. Bernard, who lived in the twelfth century, and is sometimes styled the last of the Fathers,[y] did not hesitate to bestow upon it lavish panegyric. Five long centuries had passed away, and Bernard could sometimes speak in tones to which popes and emperors were constrained to listen. So he declared, without quailing, that "It was a most famous foundation, which had bred many thousands of monks, [and monks, be it remembered, were the missionaries of those days] and was the chief place of many monasteries [i. e., was a theological university]. A place truly holy, and furnished

y Bernard, the ever-famous abbot of Clairvaulx. Bellarmine glories in the fact, that even Calvin acknowledged Bernard's piety.—De Controversiis, vol. ii. 198, *a*. Either the printer, or the Cardinal himself, has made a blind reference to Calvin; for I cannot find the passage he refers to. However, I can easily admit it, as Calvin often quotes Bernard, and with great respect. So, then, with Bellarmine on one side of him, and Calvin on the other, Bernard *ought* to be a virtual pope, and give *infallible* testimony. His testimony about Bangor, therefore, admits neither question nor appeal.

with many pious men, producing much fruit unto God; insomuch, that one of them, Luanus by name, is said alone to have been the founder of an hundred monasteries. Thus, its branches overspread Ireland and Scotland, so as that versicle of the Psalmist might seem to have forespoken of these times, 'Thou visitest the earth and blessest it; thou makest it very plenteous.' (Ps. 65, 9.) Neither was it into the nations before-named only, but into other countries abroad, that those shoals of holy men poured themselves like an inundation."[z] He then particularly instances his own native country, France, as highly indebted to their benevolent labors. Now, surely, if Bangor could flood Ireland, Scotland, France, and "other countries abroad," with religious instructors and heralds of salvation, then assuredly, then *most* assuredly, Bangor alone might have sufficed to rescue England from Pagan thraldom, and the Italian Augustine might safely have staid at home, and died in his appropriate nest.

The ancient Irish Church, as you have seen, was in full communion with the ancient British Church, while it would not break the bread, nor darken the doors of

z Quoted in Lindsay's Mason, p. 89. Bernard lived 1090–1153. Comp. Hospinian de Templis, editio secunda, p. 421; edit. nova, p. 354. De Monachis, 199. In the editio nova of 1669. The head of these Missionary Colleges was often, or habitually, a bishop, so as to ordain his pupils. Thus, Iona and Lindisfarne became episcopal sees. Thorndike instances Iona; and the case of Lindisfarne is indisputable.—*Thorndike, de Ratione ac Jure Finiendi Controversias*, p. 376. Thorndike's Latin works will not be found in the Anglo-Catholic Library. St. Cuthbert died in 686, and was believed to be the tutelary Bishop of Lindisfarne ever after—to have, for example, driven the Danes away in 794.—*Pontoppidan's Gesta et Vestigia Danorum*, vol. ii. p. 63.

a Romish Archbishop of Canterbury.[a] This Church, under St. Columba, founded, about A. D. 565, another most useful and renowned theological institute, on the island of Iona, or Icolmkill, an islet among the western islands of Scotland, about two miles west of the south end of the island of Mull. Of this seminary of theology, says Archdeacon Churton, "There is scarcely any other institution which Englishmen have reason to remember with feelings of equal gratitude; for, from this retreat of piety came forth those heralds of the Gospel, who taught the greater part of our rude forefathers."[b]

A disciple, (or, as we should now say, a graduate) of this ever-memorable institute, founded a third school of the prophets, on the island of Lindisfarne—now called Holy Island—an island in the German Sea, near the east coast of England, about eight miles south-east from the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed. The island of Lindisfarne was converted, in A. D. 635, into an episcopal see, by the King of Northumberland; and that see became, ultimately, the foundation of the present well-known bishopric of Durham. It was the

a Mr. Soames fully confirms this.—Latin Ch. p. 51.

b Churton's Early Eng. Ch. new ed. p. 20. This is the island about which Dr. Johnson wrote the often-quoted sentence of his journey to the Hebrides. "That man is little to be envied, whose patriotism would not gain force upon the plain of Marathon; or whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona."—*Johnson's Works*, viii. 392. I-Colm-Kill means The Isle of the Church; or, The Cell of Columba. Columba labored among the Picts and others thirty-two years.—*Lappenberg's Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. i. p. 132. "The abbot of Iona appears to have exercised a sort of primacy over the Christians of a great part of Scotland, and even Ireland, till so late a period as the ninth century." —*C. J. Lyons's History of St. Andrews*, Edinburgh, 1828, p. 15.

religious centre of Northumberland, one of the most important of the kingdoms of ancient Britain; and its missionary influence and effectiveness were signal and most momentous.[c]

These three great seminaries of Christian theology formed, if one may say so, a complete religious *cordon sanitaire* around North England; and were enough to have prevented the contagion of heresy, or paganism, from spreading and polluting the land, for a thousand years. They were *all* supplied (as we may argue from the case of Bangor) with an immense number of pupils, who were in no way a burden to the public, being all taught the art (which we moderns have boasted of, as an invention for *our* schools only) of supporting themselves, and of living upon the minimum of amount necessary for human sustenance.[d]

c Churton's Early Eng. Ch. p. 61. Smith's Life of St. Columba, p. 55. The British monks were travelling missionaries; the Roman monks were recluses; and, as Bede admits, troubled with segnitia, i. e., Anglice, laziness. The authority will be quoted directly. Meanwhile, let the great lawyer, Sir Thomas Ridley, speak. "Before his time [Benedict's] the monks of the West Church served God freely abroad, without being shut up in a cloister."—View of the Civile and Ecclesiastical Law, 2d ed. p. 187. These sort of Romans (the cloistered ones) were, doubtless, the descendants of some ecclesiastical parasites whom St. Paul found hanging about the banks of the Tiber, in his day. See his Epistle to the Romans, xvi. 18.

d Such monks as these, even John Knox and John Calvin would not have objected to.—*Gorham's Reformation Gleanings*, pp. 411–414. Selden compliments these monks, and castigates the Benedictines. Yet he must not be censured for ill-temper; he could castigate the Puritans also, though himself often called a Puritan. He calls the Puritans a "wayward sect." He was a great jurist, and a profound antiquarian; and we may accept his judgment as eminently impartial.—See for the monks, *Seldeni Opera*, vol. vi. column 1828; and for the Puritans, vol. vi. column 1406.—Compare *Hart's Eccl. Records*, ch. iii. sect. 4.

The self-supporting character of the schools, and Church system gen-

As such, they were inexpressibly better fitted for missionary labor, than the monks of Italian origin, whose object it was to erect monastic seminaries, where inmates might be supported in lazy and luxurious independence. Rapin faithfully characterizes the two classes, when he says—"Before the Benedictines [the *Italian* monks[e]—Augustine himself having been prior of the Benedictine monastery at Rome, an institution founded by Gregory, his patron] were spread over the island, the monks of St. Colomba, [Iona], less given to gain and worldly views, attended wholly to the service of God, in the places where they lived in common. But the Benedictines never rested, till they procured great numbers of monasteries with large revenues, and caused the papal authority [which ac-

erally, of the ancient British Christians, is unquestionable, and should carefully be remembered. According to Selden and Watson, the system of tythes did not formally begin in England till the close of the eighth century.—*Seldeni Opera*, vol. vi. col. 1179.—*Watson's Clergyman's Law*, p. 4.—*Hart's Eccl. Records*, ch. iii. sect. 2.—Ridley on Civil and Eccl. Law, p. 138, &c.

e "These Benedictines, with their several branches, were so numerous, and so richly endowed, that, in their *revenues*, they did match all the orders in England."—*Geeve's Church History of Great Britain*, p. 431. "We may almost say," writes Archdeacon Williams, "that the introduction of Popery was the extinction of British monasteries—at least in their primitive form."—*Antiquities of the Cymry*, pref. p. xvi. In his thirteenth chapter, he gives us some account of *twenty-five* Welsh seminaries, and says, "Such were *some* of the primitive monasteries of Cymru, which the [old British] Church made use of to advance her interest in the land." Why, even Beda cannot help contrasting the monks of Iona with the lounging Benedictines of *his* day. Speaking of Aidan from Iona, he says, "His course of life was so different from the slothfulness of our times."—*Bede*, bk iii. ch. v. or p. 277. Bede subjoins something, which incidentally illustrates how primitive and un-Romish Aidan was in his practices. He made every body who went about with him (laymen and all) read his Bible! How many of Rome's clergy set such an example to their flocks in these days?

corded them independence and other immunities] to be recognized throughout the seven kingdoms."[f] It was *such* institutions, whose property was confiscated by Henry VIII.; and when Rome is tempted to murmur at his rapacity, she had better remember that *her own* rapacity furnished the temptation, and smother her anathemas.[g] Henry would have found no plunder at a Bangor, an Iona, or a Lindisfarne; and so, if Augustine had not entered England, a reformation of monasteries would not have been necessary, and no wail would have been poured forth over their (so-called) wanton demolition.

Rapin, you perceive, adds to his testimony about the anxious zeal of the Benedictines[h] for accumulation of property, an observation about their equally anxious

f Tindal's Rapin, 4th ed. i. 281.

g Reforms of monks and nuns always bring odium on their advocates. See the Memoirs of De Ricci, whom the nuns sometimes opposed as bitterly as the monks. Dumouriez, who pictures Portugal in 1766, says that *then* one-half of the female convents were suppressed.—*Dumouriez's Account, etc.*, p. 174. Since then, Portugal has confiscated *all* the property of the Church, while Spain has done a good deal in the same direction, and may do more. A Romish Archbishop once accused Philip II. of butchering 2,000 priests, and members of religious orders, to secure his usurpation of Portugal, and getting absolution at Rome, into the bargain!—*Vertot's Revolutions of Portugal*, p. 25. After such exhibitions, Romanists may as well be quiet about the conduct of Henry VIII. The English king might have eaten up all his monasteries in welcome, if, at the same time, he could have taken down and digested the Pope's supremacy.

Least of all should Rome blame him, when it is to be remembered that she has copied his example! Will it be believed? Pope Innocent X., 1644–55, actually established at Rome a congregation for the suppression of monasteries! Picart gives an account of it, in his *Religious Ceremonies*, vol. ii. 192, London, 1734.

h The Benedictines, the only order of monks in England, before the Conquest by William of Normandy.—Eccleston's English Antiquities, p. 95, note.

zeal for the sway of the papal authority. The solution of the latter half of their devotion, is not as puzzling as that of an affected quadratic equation in algebra. Gregory, with all his array of meekness, was the first of the popes who granted monks exemption from the authority of bishops, and constituted them the body-guards, or retainers, of his own peculiar see. Hence, the papal throne has never had, and never will have, to the last day of its mortal history, such loyal servitors and vassals, as those orders, of which it is the solitary head, the direct point of intercourse, and the always self-interested guardian.*j*

The principle with which the papal monks started in England, was the one which Augustine inaugurated, and which his successors followed with sleepless industry, viz.: Roman conversions, rather than catholic ones—Italian conversions, rather than English ones—conversions gainful to their own pockets, rather than conversions to the common cause of Christianity.

i Bruy's Hist. des Papes, i. 383. Van Espen says he did not go all lengths.—(*Jus Canonicum*, pars iii. tit. 12, ch. 2, n. 20.) Who ever supposed he did? Others, by and by, *developed* the thing sufficiently.—*Father Paul on Eccl. Benefices*, 3d edit. 1736, p. 34. Subsequent popes sold similar exemptions to universities. In a controversy between the University of Oxford and an Abp of Canterbury, about *his* right of visitation, a British king was forced to exclaim, "The Pope doth as much to bear down bishops as any Puritan in England."—Ayliffe's Ancient and Present State of the University of Oxford, edit. 1714, vol. ii. p. 259.

j During the temporary suppression of the Jesuits, a Papal nuncio was found one of the best defenders of ex-Jesuits, "whom his court also supported, because it saw that, *if it would continue to be a court*, it must not allow these vigorous satellites of its despotism to be crushed." —*De Ricci's Memoirs*, i. p. 123.—Great Britain thought she had provided against them, in the Emancipation Bill. But Michelsen shows how easily all the exceptions of that bill against the Jesuits have been, and are still evaded.—*Modern Jesuitism*, pp. 122–25.

But the missionaries from the North were disposed to allow their converts full liberty, in both ecclesiastical and civil rights and interests, i. e., all the legitimate liberty reasonable or possible. Well does Archdeacon Churton perceive this, and explicitly does he say—after telling his readers that the Italian missionaries rarely ordained a native Saxon to the ministry, and the popes took special care to send *all* the early archbishops of Canterbury from Italy[k]—"The Scottish churchmen, on the contrary, being less anxious to prolong their own mission, than to make Christians of the Saxons, began very soon to associate natives of the country with them in their labors; and *did not make it a point of turning their converts into Scotchmen.*"[l] It is easy to see from this, which set of missionaries endeavored to promote the genuine catholicity of the Christian religion, and which the (so called) catholicity of the Church of Rome!

Missionaries from Bangor, and Iona, and Lindisfarne, are well known to the impartial, in the history of the conversion of the Saxons to Christianity; and, without them, it is not too much to say, that the Latin Church might have done its uttermost in Britain, and struggled in vain.[m] It is criminal, it is atrocious, to

k "Eight Roman monks were successively Archbishops of Canterbury, before that dignity, *instituted for the Saxons*, was attained by a man of Saxon race."—Thierry's Norman Conquest, i. 45.

l Churton's Early Eng. Ch. new ed. pp. 65, 66.

m Comp. the note from Thierry, p. 5, this lecture. "The Scottish, that professed no subjection to the Church of Rome, were they that sent preachers for the conversion of these countries, and ordained bishops to govern them."—*Abp Usher's Religion of the Ancient Irish*, ch. x. near the end. The countries alluded to were North, East, and Middle Eng-

pass over their instrumentality in the conversion of the Saxons, simply because they were dissenters from Latin Christianity. Nevertheless, what they underwent, and what they accomplished, as a part of an ancient, independent British, Scotch, and Irish Christianity, is little known; and, so far as Roman historians are concerned, might go down to posterity, "unwept, unnoted, and for ever dead."[n] While Romish missionaries are surrounded, as it were, with all the aids of the world of spirits, and achieve miracles, beside which those of the apostles themselves look meagre and dim! One miracle, however, be it formally noted—the gift of tongues—the power to speak untaught, the rough Saxon, and, as Fuller calls it, "the more manly if less melodious," British[o]—seems, on no occasion, to have been granted them. There was none which soft-voiced Italians wanted more; and it was a gift which came, to genuine missionaries of Heaven, unbidden and unexpected.[p] To *their* wishes, however, it never was imparted—almost the only miracle, perhaps, which, in some shape or other, they could not counterfeit!

And here my lecture must have an end. It has exhibited to you (as is hoped) a still further and

land, or "the large kingdom of Mercia." How characteristic of Rome to ignore such men, and to say coolly, with Pastorini, "The Saxons in Britain received the Christian doctrine from St. Austin, and his companions;" as if they, and they alone, had brought the knowledge of Christianity to that people!—*Pastorini's Gen. History of the Church*, p. 106.

n Pope's Odyssey, v, 402.

o Fuller, i. 163.—From his noble eulogy of the old British tongue.

p Britons and Saxons not converted to Popery, London, 1748, p. 316.

stronger proof of the unlikeness of the ancient Christianity of England, of Wales, of Scotland, and of Ireland, to the new Christianity which was imported from Italy, and abetted by every possible Italian device, and effort, and pains-taking, till Great Britain was Romanized to an extent, which rendered necessary an ecclesiastical revolution. That revolution was the Reformation ;[q] and when a revolution merely ejects, and wipes off, and blots out a foreign intrusion and usurpation, the most conservative mind on earth ought not to summon it to an arbitrament. England never submitted tamely or graciously, to the papal supremacy ;[r] but always fretted and chafed under it, and won back its independence, piece by piece, till with one mighty, convulsive effort—like a man springing up erect from a fit of the nightmare—it hurled the sovereignty of popery from its bosom. It has sent that sovereignty on a long exile, of three hundred years ; and its hopes of restoration seem few and faint indeed. True, it has nominally appropriated England, a second time ; but if the appropriation were worth the paper,

q Bp Gauden is certainly moderate enough ; yet he defends it fearlessly.—*Hieraspistes*, p. 234, etc. ; Puller's Moderation of the Church of England, ch. xvi. It was a great blessing to the Welsh ; for in the reign of Henry VIII. they ceased to be *aliens*, and became entitled to all the privileges of British subjects, "by act of Parliament." In Queen Elizabeth's reign they had the Bible and the Liturgy, translated for them into their native tongue. This is the way in which Protestantism treated them !—*Heylyn's Cosmography*, 2d ed. pp. 323, 329.

r "It is to be observed that, as under the temporal monarchy of Rome, Britain was one of the last provinces that was subdued, and one of the first that was lost again ; so, under the spiritual monarchy of the pope, England was one of the last countries in Christendom that received his yoke, and one of the first that cast it off."—*Essays of Sir B. Whitlocke*, 1706, p. 160.

or parchment, on which it is written, England's mightiness would be felt a second time, like the renovated energies of Sampson. The most which popery can now do, is to style Queen Elizabeth (as it does) the mere Princess Elizabeth;[s] and to intimate that all her successors are usurpers, reigning without the allowance of the see of Rome. It remains for England to requite this action by its parallels ; to send a bishop of her own, with a fleet to back him, to the mouth of the Tiber, and to treat the so-styled pontiff of Christendom as the Most Rev. Dr. Ferretti, a simple metropolitan.[t] That would bring matters to a proper issue; and England would be acting in her proper character —and not, as she has sometimes done, for *political*

s Migne's Encyclopedie Theologique ; Dictionnaire des Papes, 1857, column 1137, art. Pius V.—Pius V. is the pontiff who first excommunicated Elizabeth and *commanded* his followers to dethrone her. Gregory XIII. had to issue a bull of suspension, to give papists temporary exemption from Pius's mandates. But even he admitted that Pius's bull was still binding on heretics. So *Protestant* England is as much under its ban as ever ; and at the proper moment it will have full force given it.—*Phelan's Church of Rome in Ireland,* p. 181, etc. The abuse of England and of Elizabeth still continues. Some Romish writers grossly insult her memory, calling her "une femme à la fois reine, et papesse."—*Wordsworth's Letters to Gondon,* vol. i. p. 295. This is the Jesuitically artistic way of retorting for the story of Pope Joan.

t As to titles, the Council of Nice, and the ancient ecclesiastical historians, call the pope simply, The Bishop of Rome. The Council of Chalcedon call him archbishop ; and so they call the Bishop of Constantinople. Titles do not amount to much on an ancient page, as Blondel on the Primacy shows, *ex abundanti.* On eight folio pages, (33–41,) bespattered all over with references, he proves that others have been as much belauded with names of dignity, sanctity, and grandeur as the Bishop of Rome. The oath exacted by Henry VIII. of Gardiner and Bonner, and *which they took,* requires them to abate the former titles of the pope, and to call him *Bishop of Rome,* or *fellow brother* only, "as the old manner of the most ancient bishops hath been."—*Hart's Ecclesiastical Records,* 2d ed. p. 61.

ends, most grievously out of character—as, e. g., when she fought the battles of Spain, and virtually restored the Inquisition—the battles of Pius VII., and virtually restored the Jesuits.[u] England has suffered some what, of late years, at the hands of Rome; and if so —I am most sorry to say it, but must declare my candid conviction—it is a recompense which she might easily have forefended, and now richly deserves. It may be hoped she will by and by bring on the right issue with her quondam invader, and still insolent and implacable foe. It will then be developed, unmistakably, whether there is such a thing as undivided loyalty to one's native country; or whether such loyalty, even if nominally sworn to, is an empty name.[v]

u The Inquisition at Goa was suppressed "at the recommendation of the British government." Why, then, did it allow Ferdinand VII. of Spain, whom it had restored to his throne, to establish a tribunal, whom one of Britain's favored sons compared to "hell plucked up by the roots?"—See *Lieut. Burton's Goa*, etc., 1851, pp. 45, 46. Southey, in his Vindiciæ, p. 423, used the quoted language. He may have been reading, when he wrote it, Rome's condemnation of Trautmansdorf on Toleration, which was represented as "sprung from the bottom of hell."—*Erskine's Ecclesiastical Sketches*, 1790, p. 229. Or, an account of such treatment as Protestant Bibles have experienced in Ireland, where they have been picked up with a pair of tongs, and buried in a dung-heap!—*Orpen's Reflections*, London, 1825, p. 40.

v Rome's hostility to a free government, and to oaths of allegiance to any anti-Romish government, are things which ought to be better understood than they are. Dr. Erskine shows, in a few words, that it would be considered less of an offence to violate an oath to a non-Romish government, than to keep it. Of course, such an oath would not be worth the ink it took to write it.—*Erskine's Sketches*, pp. 133, 128. Compare *Rosetti's Dissertations*, vol. i. p. 50, and note *c*. J. Blanco White's *Evidence against Catholicism*, Letter ii.

Well did Prof. Tamburini exclaim, "There is nothing which more needs explanation, for the young especially, than the object and limits of ecclesiastical power."—*Prælectiones*, vol. v. p. 8. As a specimen, in his tenth prælection, he shows that the Roman Index was not a law in *his*

Henry VIII. was accustomed to say—and want what he might, he did not want for shrewdness—that there was no such thing possible as genuine loyalty under a foreign pontifical supremacy; that, e. g., when fidelity to himself and fidelity to the pope conflicted,[w] the *latter* ever had the ascendancy in the breast of a Roman Catholic.[x]

country. Well might he be nervous, for De Ricci plainly said, that the Court of Rome required bishops to resist governments, when they trenched on the pope's rights, and dictated answers for them.—*Memoirs*, vol. ii. pp. 8, 22. In a bull to the King of the Romans, in 1712, the pope cancelled the oaths prejudicial to the rights of *his* Church.—*Neve's Animadversions on Cardinal Pole's Life*, p. 501. Paul the Third forgave any one's sins, who died fighting for the Holy See; and commanded the angels to take his soul straight to Paradise.—*Foxes and Firebrands*, part ii. p. 24. Comp. *Clarke on the King's and Pope's Supremacy*, ch. ii. Indeed, as appears by the examination of Roger Holland, in the days of the Reformation, it was then notorious, that neither Papist nor Anabaptist would support any government not sworn to observe *their* tenets.—*Maitland on the Reformation*, p. 569. In view of such, and similar things, the able author of *Hints on Toleration*, London, 1810, comes to this conclusion, "So long as either the inferior or dignified orders of the Papal Hierarchy pretend to exercise the power of absolution, it will continue essential to the peace of a Protestant State to forbid the inculcation of their principles," p. 66. This same astute author explains, why the rule of the Council of Constance, that faith is not to be kept with heretics to the prejudice of the Church, does not appear in the council's printed acts, and is so often denied and evaded. *That* was retained in manuscript!—*Hints*, etc., pp. 66, 341. *Clarke on the Supremacy of the King and Pope*, p. 19. How *can* people, who will thus abuse the confidence of others, expect any confidence in return? Suspicion is the inevitable and undying recompense of a deceiver.

w Compare Wordsworth's remarks on a Romish bishop's oath to the Pope.—*Letters to Gondon*, vol. i. 282, etc.; also, vol. ii. p. 55, etc. Even the Spanish Church has objected to the phrase of that oath, "the royalties of St. Peter;" and commanded a clause to be inserted, to signify that the oath was taken "without prejudice to the regal rights."—*Hales's Primitive Church of the British Isles*, pp. 316, 317.

x Queen Mary could not be queen of Ireland till the Pope made her such. Paul IV. "affirmed that it belonged to *him alone*, as he saw proper, either to erect new kingdoms, or to abolish the old: however, he condescended to erect Ireland into a kingdom, and then admitted the

Let the great issue of loyalty to one's country be then tried; and come, if need be, at no distant day. Protestantism will not shrink from the experiment however bloody. It has lasted to Rome's daily and hourly confusion, hundreds of years; and if Rome thinks it can be extinguished, the sooner it undertakes that work by violence the better. Rome has lost and is losing countries, while Protestantism is losing handfuls; and if Protestantism is to be annihilated for the world's salvation, Rome has not a moment to lose in undertaking the most formidable battle the world's history will ever have on record.

I invoke no such issue, Brethren; but my prayer is, that God may prepare us, or our children, for its early or tardy coming. Christ himself died for the victory of the truth; and if we so die, our death will be better than a life of selfish enjoyment, prolonged beyond all the lives of the antediluvian patriarchs consolidated into one.

Queen's title to be assumed, from his own concession."—*Clarke's Memoirs of the King's Supremacy, and of the Supremacy of the Pope*, London, 1809, p. 80.

SERMONS

PREACHED ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS.

SERMON I.

THE QUESTIONER OF FUNDAMENTAL VERITIES.

"*And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die. For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.*"—Genesis, iii. 4, 5.

It is supposed to be one of the peculiarities of this age, that it calls in question, and boldly denies, principles which former ages esteemed impregnable, and beyond all dispute. But it seems to me, my Brethren, to be a great misconception, that it is either a very new thing or a very strange thing to have the most fundamental verities in morals and religion exposed to all sorts of attacks whatever. Is there, for instance, any more material or irrefutable fact, in the history of human nature, than its frailty and mortality? any fact which we ourselves should less sooner think of denying, or gainsaying? And yet, here is that fact, denounced as incredible, and almost farcical, at the commencement nearly of our race's history—at the period of its infancy—beyond all contradiction. In

that period, we hear one saying of us, in language too plain to be evaded, Ye shall not surely die. Saying this too, you perceive, in terms of the most imperative and unmistakable character—not hinting sceptically, ye may not perhaps die; or maintaining, with the self-persuasion of a rationalist, ye ought not surely to die; but affirming, with a right down positiveness, ye *shall* not surely die.

And, moreover, in this example, you see with whom this practice, of confronting and disputing fundamental verities, commenced—with that first and most implacable enemy of our race, who has been styled its murderer from the beginning—one who has never been contented with dislike of us, or alienation from us, but has ever been contriving mischief, of the most deadly character, for our present happiness and future hopes —one who is not inaptly represented in Scripture, as prowling with the remorseless appetite of a hungry lion, seeking whom he may devour.

It is a practice, then, of satanic origin, of diabolical temper and pertinacity, to withstand verities which lie at the foundation of human history and destiny, and the denial and disregard of which unsettles every thing, and introduces lawlessness of opinion, untamableness of will, and anarchy in action. Yet, bad as the practice is, when contemplated from a stand-point, which shows us how, and when, and by whom, it was introduced into the world, mankind seem in nowise to have given it up, or eschewed it, in any portion of the chequered story of their degenerate race. This

point I shall now endeavor to illustrate by examples; and then proceed another step, and illustrate its effect upon ourselves, in making our faith too often a perversion, and not a blessing.

I.—First, then, let us attend to some examples, from various classes and conditions, which go unitedly to show, that it is the characteristic of errorists, and particularly of errorists in religion, to deny the most palpable verities, with the most confident and unyielding dogmatism.

I am sometimes gravely asked, how it is possible for a man, who must have *some* doubts respecting the position he assumes, in combating a known (at least a widely acknowledged) truth, how it is possible for such a man to assert, so frequently and so roundly as he does, that the truth which he opposes is an evident and flagrant error. And the *philosophical* answer I suppose to be, that when a man has a feebler response than usual, in behalf of some favorite opinion, from his inward convictions, or from his conscience, that *then* he endeavors to sustain himself, by the wordiness, or the persistiveness, or plausible sophistry of his tongue. He seeks and provokes controversy, in order to bolster himself up by false arguments; fancying, that if he can vanquish an antagonist *without*, he can also allay his own qualms and disturbances *within*. And if we could see such a man, in his retirements, even after he has acquitted himself famously, by false logic and glossy rhetoric, in the presence of others, we should find him as little satisfied with himself as ever, and craving more than ever that solid certainty for

his positions, which he arrogated with pride in the hour of fierce contention.[a]

Who can suppose, for an instant, that Satan, with the ken of an archangel, was unaware of the mortality threatened to man for disobedience, and of the infallibility of its infliction, if man should venture to do wrong? Yet see how he outbraves his own inward persuasions, and abashes his sensitive auditor by brazen assurance. "Ye shall not surely die," is his dogged premise; and then he goes straight onward, to clinch the matter, by an appeal which, it seems, was too mighty for unfallen human nature, and has always proved all but omnipotent with human nature in its degeneracy—an appeal to pride and curiosity. "For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." What consummate shamelessness, what infernal art! No wonder that they achieved a triumph *then*, when they have been achieving such triumphs for six long thousand years, from the first doleful day when their career of recklessness began.

And now for some historic parallels to this attempt to dispossess us of genuine faith, by openly impugning established and fundamental verities.

a.—I find the first in the early history of schism. Schismatics in the Church have often manifested the

a Abusers of others in public suffer keenly enough in their retirements. I can never forget the description of Tacitus, referring to the case of Tiberius: "Si recludantur tyrannorum mentes, posse adspici laniatus et ictus; quando, ut corpora verberibus, ita sævitiâ, libidine, malis consultis, animus dilaceretur."—Annals, lib. vi. 6.

same self-confidence which the grand enemy of human nature exhibited, without a resort to his peculiar arts, and often, therefore, without his marvellous success. The confessed schismatics who attended the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, were invited there with unasked, and, probably, with unexpected courtesy. Their chief point of difference with their neighbors was, not matters of doctrine, or matters of discipline, but a matter of feeling—they, for instance, feeling themselves to be spiritually purer and better than those neighbors, so that they looked upon their pretensions to piety with absolute disallowance, if not disdain.

And now were these men (called the Cathari, or the Puritans of those days) at all squeamish about their ecclesiastical separation, or any more to be reasoned with than their successors of modern times, who have looked upon themselves as the genuine elect of Heaven, and upon others as doubtfully, if at all hopefully, converted. By no means—by no manner of means, whatever. Even the condescension of the illustrious Constantine, the first great Christian emperor, could not move them one iota from their anchorage of uncharitableness towards others, and settled satisfaction with themselves. He held a parley with their chief bishop—since the Puritans of those days did believe in bishops, when they had the office and the power of it in their own keeping. He inquired, and he argued, and he remonstrated, and he appealed. But he might as well have held a conference with the winds, and attempted to wheel them in their devious circuits. He abandoned the case in utter despondency,

and with this ever-memorable warning. Plant a ladder, said he, by yourself, and climb alone into heaven.[b]

Such an example has schism followed a thousand times, instead of once, and pursued its separation and its intolerance with a steadiness which, in a better cause, might entitle it to the glories of martyrdom. And heresy has done as famously, if not more so, in some of its bruited chieftains. Socinus, the founder of modern Socinianism, was certainly one of these; and he was a man, too, who had had contentions enough with some of his own disciples to render him somewhat diffident about the impregnability of his theological position. Not improbably he had as frequent qualms in private, as many like him have had, when they found themselves warring with the common sentiment of the Church, and the general current of its history.

Yet in public, while in the attitude of controversy, when he had a bad eminence to keep, and a wrong self-consistency to maintain, no one could be bolder—bolder to rashness, and even folly. Why, exclaimed he to an antagonist, I am as certain of the truth of my opinions, as that I hold this hat in my hand.[c] An allegation in which he took the ground, that his opinions were as demonstrable as facts open to the senses, or present to one's consciousness. But this is more, perhaps, than can be asserted for the being itself of God. The existence of a God is not an object of knowledge, but an object of belief—not an object of

b Socrates, Ecc. Hist. bk i. ch. x.
c Bibliotheca Fratrum, Pol. ii. 768.

consciousness, but of firm persuasion. Whence, it appears, that Socinus claimed for his opinions a degree of certainty which no metaphysician can claim for the foundation-truth of all religion whatever—the existence of a Supreme Being.

c.—Still (to go on to another case), Socinus was not more positive of his theological correctness than the infidel Rousseau was of his moral correctness. Rousseau published confessions to the world which held up to public view his own shame, and the shame of manifold contemporaries. But with what species of moral air and bearing, think you? Why, with a sort of defiant heroism upon which apostles have not ventured, when giving to the world, not their own lives, but that of Jesus Christ. "These," said John, epitomizing the object of his Gospel in a single sentence, "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that, believing, ye might have life through his name."[d] But when Rousseau issued pages reeking with scepticism and libertinism, this was his fool-hardy bravado. "Let the last trumpet sound when it will, I will come with this book in my hand, and present myself before the Sovereign Judge. I will boldly proclaim, thus have I acted, thus have I thought, such was I, ... and then let a single one tell thee, if he dare, I was better than that man."

d.—Rousseau outstripped apostles, who published nothing for their own glorification, and was unques-

d John, xx. 31.

tionably a peer in self-confidence to the schismatic and heretic; but the idolaters of ancient Ephesus were, possibly, more than peers for both, and all. Hear their unequalled professions of assurance, as given us in the Acts of the Apostles. They averred that all Asia, and the world beside, had the same object of devotion with themselves. They declared that there was not a man upon earth who did not know Ephesus—their religious home—and the great goddess, Diana, before whose shrine they offered homage. Nay, to crown the climax of assumptions, they vehemently maintained that these were things not only undenied, but undeniable—things which *could* not be spoken against.[e]

Every human being, you perceive, was challenged by them, to attest and dignify the religion of avowed idolatry. They describe such a religion as one spreading far and wide, till it has attained unrivalled universality. Nay, more, they depict it not only as a religion commanding universal homage and admiration, but as a system which had not only never been excepted to, but which *could* not be excepted to. It was not to be pronounced against, by mortal tongue; for its doctrines were as obvious as axioms, and as safe from contradiction as the laws of matter.

Such, then, are the manifestations of self-confidence, and of a disposition to arraign, question, and contradict any opinions, not accordant with its individual preferences, which have been developed in such

e Acts, xix. 27–36.

characters as Satan, as schismatics, as heretics, as infidels, as idolaters. And am I now asked, whether it is at all new, or strange, for persons in grievous error to array themselves against the most incontestable, and most generally accepted truths whatever; my answer is, that familiarity with such deplorable histories as those of Satan himself, as those of the ringleaders in our world's moral mischiefs (the schismatic, the heretic, the infidel, and the idolater,) can satisfy any inquirer, that the habit of disputing the most sacred and fundamental verities, is one which has infected the ranks of the enemies of true religion, like the virus of pestilence. It has maddened them into a delirium of impiety. They have struck at such truths, with as little modesty, and as little evidence of remorse or hesitation, as Satan exhibited, when he uttered before High Heaven the palpable and damnable falsehood, Ye shall not surely die.

Of course, then, the same habit is to be anticipated, and encountered, and provided against, still. It must never surprise us, therefore, to encounter it, or to encounter it in an apparently aggravated form. Error (like Satan himself, the grandest errorist we know of,) will assume any form, in which it can maintain its favorite sentiments. If necessary, it can come in the beaming and winning garb of an angel of light. But if it may be less complaisant, if it may be dashy, browbeating, imperiously dogmatical, it will assume a port, not one whit less overbearing than Satan's, when he pronounced the seductive lie, which first shook human

confidence in the truth of God—the lie which our text has engraved upon an everlasting record.

Oh, my Brethren, be not abashed, or disheartened, by the sturdy, inflexible impudence of error. It spares not (as you have seen) the declarations of God's own lips—not the most solemn, the most mandatory, the most pregnant, or the most far-reaching of them. Be not thrown from your balance, then, when it strives to overturn your faith in them, or in any one of them, by arraying itself in the panoply of an assurance, in which Satan himself has been its great exemplar, tempter and persuader. Let not such patterns make your hearts grow cold with apprehension, and your fortitude give way. Fly to the shelter of such encouragement, as Christ gave his wavering apostles, "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me." Believe you in Jesus, though *his* worst foe, and *your* own worst antagonist tells you to believe rather in your own hearts' wishes, and your reason's brave conjectures. Let the voice of eternal wisdom ring in your ears, when the lies of vanity, and self-confidence, and pride, and prying curiosity, tempt you to listen to their insinuations—I say, rather than listen to such things, let the voice of eternal wisdom ring in your ears, the testimony which Solomon verified by bitter experience, "He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool."*f*

II.—And now, in the next place, to help on this admonition, let me show you some of the disastrous

f Prov. xxviii. 26. The heart, with the Hebrews, was the seat of intellect, as well of moral sentiment and affection.

effects produced in men, by listening not to the truest, but the boldest, asserter of moral and religious opinions.

The chief mischief which results from it is, that it inclines us at last to reverse entirely the declaration of Scripture, "It is better to trust in the Lord, than to put confidence in man."[g]

How singular, my Brethren, considered from a just and proper point of view, how profoundly singular, that it should be necessary for the highest authority and wisdom in the universe, to utter such a declaration! Why, one would suppose, that a child, fresh from its leading strings, would hardly need an inspired warrant for the proposition, that it is better to trust Omnipotence, than the most incessant and incurable frailty—Omniscience, than a sagacity which cannot penetrate the secrets of one to-morrow, and provide against its disasters. But there the record lies, penned, as it were, by the Lord's own hand, that it is better to trust the Lord, than to put confidence in the poor creatures of his power. And if *such* a record has had to be blazoned before us, it must *so* have been made conspicuous, because it states a fact, or result, contrary to all usual human experience—one, as it were, of Mr. Hume's miracles—because, as a habit, man esteems it better to trust one like himself, than One like the God who made him, and who may rightfully claim his unbounded and perpetual homage.

But whence, oh whence, and why, this sad defalca-

g Psalm cxviii. 8—"Any confidence." Psalter translation.

tion from rectitude, this contradiction of (one might well say) the simplest axiom of salvation, that we should go to an original source for help in an extremity, and never rely in preference on those which are secondary and far inferior? Why should man stop short with his fellow, and demonstrate it to be so easy to put faith in him, and so difficult, so habitually difficult, so arduously difficult, to take a few steps further onward, and put not a different faith, or less faith, but the same faith, in God himself, all-knowing and almighty? The secret (at least one good part of it) is, human impressibility under dogmatism and self-assurance, and human insusceptibility before quiet, modest, self commending truth. Propositions which have the readiest and the loudest oracle to endorse them, are heard with open ears; while those which speak but to our consciences, to our wayward earthly wills, are heard with suspicion, reluctance, or aversion. We find it easier to put confidence in man, when man tells us with an audacity resembling Satan's—what our degenerate nature likes—than to trust in the Lord, when *he* tells us, with an Amen which neither earth nor heaven can shake one atom, what our degenerate nature liketh not.

And we shall ever do so, if we will allow schism, or heresy, or any form of pestilential error to attract and bend us, by its noisy, dogmatical, persistive declarations. It is easier for a perverted mind to defend and to propagate error, than we imagine. Such a mind rejoices in the destruction of our mental equipoise, or innocence. It revels in the unholy gratifica-

tion of producing in another mind the disturbances which harrass and vex its own. Satan's soul was like the troubled ocean, "chafing with its shores," and he would fain have put the minds of our first parents into a similar turbulent condition. He knew, as surely as he knew his own existence—he knew *by* and *in* the pangs of a never-wasting misery, that God not only *would* not, but that he *could* not lie. And yet he maintained, with outward unquailing pertinacity, that God had uttered a palpable and a conscious falsity: "Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." And he pronounced this with a tongue as unfaltering and oily, as that of an advocate who tells a jury his client is absolutely innocent, when he knows, in his secret soul, that if legally and technically innocent, he is morally a villain of crimson dye. And a jury accredit such statements just as our first parents accredited Satan; because they would a little rather believe so, than be constrained to believe otherwise, and exercise an uncomfortable responsibility.

My Brethren, if we are going upon the principle of *pleasing* ourselves rather than of *profiting* ourselves by the faith we adopt—and especially of pleasing ourselves in time, rather than of profiting ourselves in eternity—of pleasing what St. Paul calls the corrupt law in our members, rather than the high and holy law of a sanctified mind—then we shall perpetually put confidence in ourselves, rather than in something above ourselves, and better than ourselves; creatures,

the architecture of whose being is Divine, but who have defaced and abused that architecture, till it has become ruinous and unreliable.[h] Then we shall go on reversing the maxim of heavenly prudence, as our race has been reversing it for thousands of years, and shall find it easier and better to put confidence in man, than to trust the Lord that made man, and that bought him off from ruin, when man had unmade himself. Settle it, therefore, beforehand, whether you will have an agreeable faith, or a saving faith—a faith for the self-sufficiency of reason, or a faith for the necessities of the soul—a faith for this world, or a faith for the world to come. If you want a faith adapted to this life merely, then listen to such perverters as assured Eve, that God's sorest threatenings are empty wind, and will never be fulfilled—that God's supremest declarations, even about himself, are not to be taken as original and infallible law, but must be tested under a higher law, must be brought to trial before the court of your own petty judgment, and be accepted or disallowed accordingly.

Doubtless you can have your way about these things, as well as about concerns of inferior importance. It is the awful prerogative of free agency, to believe a lie, when a lie is asserted with the roundness and steadfastness of truth. And when a free agent has long perverted this sacred liberty, from the high and holy function to which God at first consigned it, then God judicially gives him the reins, and helps

h Ezekiel, vii. 20.

him onward in the terrible work of moral declension. He allows strong delusions to enter and prepossess his self-dishonored soul, so that it learns to believe lies, rather than truth; precisely as a corrupted sensual appetite,

> ——"though to a radiant angel linked,
> Will sate itself in a celestial bed,
> And prey on garbage."*i*

"Hear," says a poet, not of æsthetics, but of high morality,

> "Hear the just law, the judgment of the skies,
> He that hates truth shall be the dupe of lies;
> And he who will be cheated to the last,
> Delusions strong as hell shall bind him fast."*j*

Behold your fate then, ye who are ready to be seduced by the bold mien, the loud voice, and the sophistic tongue of error, questioning truth in its most fundamental forms. Error shall become your downbearing, iron-handed taskmaster, if you listen to its daring insinuations. You may be deluded, hoodwinked, rendered bat-blind, and doubt your own self-evident mortality. But, ah, what will this beguiling hallucination avail you, when God taketh away the soul? Since inevitable truth and you must, sooner or later, come in direct and fateful contact, why blink it, and shun it, now? It will pierce your soul, at length, like a sword, if you will not *now* give its gentler addresses welcome. It will only acquire fresh weight,

i Hamlet, i. 5. *j* Cowper's Progress of Error.

by your futile rebellion against its claims; and in vindicating those claims finally it will grind you to powder. Oh, believe in the doctrines of Christ your Redeemer, now; or the repulse of Christ your Judge will thrust you into the depths of hell.

SERMON II.

THE BURNING BUSH: ITS MEANING AND APPLICATIONS.

"*And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him, out of the midst of a bush; and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed.*"—Exodus, iii. 2.

THERE is so much of the curious and the beautiful in the Divine manifestation here brought to view, that it were to be wished its moral significance might be approached without delay. But it is not the destiny of the most important texts, to be always the most accessible. When the courtier of Queen Candace was meditating upon one of the profoundest of the prophecies of Isaiah, he had to pause and rest upon the question, "Of whom speaketh the prophet this?"[a] And, thus here, my Brethren, such and so numerous have been the theories indulged respecting this symbolic representation of Divinity, that we must turn aside from the more interesting and more momentous question, about its moral pertinency, to enquire concerning its bare signification. Our first business, then, with the text, is the somewhat unattractive one

[a] Acts, viii. 34.

of determining its proper interpretation. But as the step is absolutely necessary for progress, it is hoped you will follow it without aversion.

The text, as you are informed, has been the subject of conjecture, and an illustration of the versatility of criticism. I must take my choice, therefore, among authorities, and offer you the suggestions which have prevailed in my own mind, with the reasons which have governed my conclusions.

The most prevalent theories of the text have made the bush, with its envelope of fire, a symbol of the Mother of our Lord[b]—a type, *e. g.*, of her perpetual virginity—or a symbol of our Lord's incarnation in the likeness of sinful flesh—or a symbol of the Church amid the onsets of persecution. Thus, some even of the Fathers suppose a bush, which was burning, yet not consumed, an emblem of a virgin mother who remained a virgin still. While, with others, a lowly bush, a bramble, perhaps, which was inhabited and illuminated with an unkindled, unwasting flame, seemed an apt prototype of God manifest in the flesh —a problem which was unfolded and demonstrated in the person of Jesus Christ. With most, however, the bush, surrounded and interpenetrated with fire, yet unharmed, and, most especially, unconsumed for a long time, appears to be an exact and striking picture of the Church, amid the assaults and furies of persecution, none of which can prevail against her, though they emanate from the gates of hell.

b Limborch on the Inquisit. p. 465.

Now, from each and all of these theories I am constrained, not rashly, I trust, nor superciliously, but with modest firmness, to dissent. And I do so, my Brethren, on the ground of that great and invariable rule of interpretation which bids us look, not to our own fancies, but to a writer himself, for his meaning; and, if any passage in his pages be doubtful, to have regard to his general scope or drift, and to study his context thoroughly. Under such a rule, the idea that our text has reference to the Virgin Mary, or to our Saviour's incarnation, may be at once dismissed; for how easy, soever, to conceive of the fitness of the bush and the fire to represent such things, the great Lawgiver does not throw out the remotest hints to us, to suppose them intended or adapted for such a purpose.

The only theory of consequence which remains, then, is the one which supposes the bush and the fire to symbolize the Church in the midst of affliction and persecution, with her capability and certainty of final triumph. It will be more difficult to prove that this is not the idea—to say the very least, the leading and primary idea—designed to be conveyed by these expressive emblems; and, accordingly—

I. My first effort will be, to show what (if the text is *not* designed to impart a lively conviction respecting such points,) it is the rather designed to mean.

The rule, the great rule of interpretation, to seek for what an author actually means in his own words, rather than for what *we ourselves* might have meant by similar words; and to seek for that out of himself, out of his scope, drift and context, rather than out of our

own fancies, has been distinctly mentioned. Now, then, with the narrative before us, respecting the burning bush, the true question is, What is the prominent subject of the portion of the Sacred Narrative where we find it, and what was its significance in the view of God, and of Moses, the high minister of God's will? What were the circumstances under which the manifestation of God in the bush was made? I say the manifestation of God *himself;* for I will not trouble you with the impertinent distinctions which critics have tried to make here, between God and his angel. An angel might have been the forerunner, or herald of Jehovah, on this occasion, as on a hundred others; yet nothing is more certain than that the speaker was God, addressing Moses in his own name, and in a style of complete supremacy and majesty.

The circumstances which called forth this peculiar demonstration of the Almighty were, unquestionably, the calamities which were hovering over, and harassing, his peculiar people. We have his own express testimony for this. "And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows."[c] And his design in making himself visibly known was, unquestionably, also to give them assurance that he would manifest himself in their behalf, and accomplish their speedy and effectual deliverance.

But now comes a question of the greatest point and

c Exod. iii. 7.

moment. How should this be done? Here were a people notoriously testy and incredulous, (as even the temper and answers of Moses himself demonstrated,) and if no token of higher significance were given, than had been given already, they would fall back into their old querulousness, and murmur as bitterly, and doubt as distrustfully, as ever. It need scarcely be said, that God himself was fully aware of this. He is prepared for the captiousness of Moses, when he shrinks from the commission of approaching Pharaoh with a warning from above. "And Moses said unto God, who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt?"[d] And God's answer was immediately ready, "Certainly I will be with thee; and this shall be a token unto thee: When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain." Nay, and when Moses persists, a further answer was ready, which carried the argument to the utmost —appealing to the very loftiest of all prerogatives in the Godhead—its Self-existence—that attribute of Divinity which the incommunicable, and, to a Jew, the unpronounceable name, Jehovah, is intended to mark and honor.[e] "And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and He said, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."[f]

The meaning of "I AM" is, I am by myself, and of

d Ex. vii. 11.

e Wisdom, xiv. 21. Josephus, Antiq. ii. 12. 4. Moses uses Exod. xxxiv. 9.

f Ex. iii. 14.

myself, i. e., independent and underived—perfectly self-existent, and as such, of course, the source of all life, power, and action. The word "Jehovah" corresponds, in Hebrew, to "I am" in English; and as has been said, is deemed so awfully sacred by a Jew, that he never will utter it, but always substitutes for it, in his reading of the Old Testament, some other title of Divinity; generally that one which means "The Lord." And this peculiar deference for the loftiest of the Divine appellations has been followed, too, by the translators of our Bible; who almost invariably abstain from using the word Jehovah, although it is said to occur in the Old Testament more than six thousand times.

So, then, it appears, that when God addressed himself to his faint-hearted and distrustful people, he condescended to use with them the last and loftiest of arguments to subdue their fears and re-animate their hopes. And as his main object in his interview with Moses, was to accomplish this gracious purpose, the simple and obvious question follows, whether the emblems under which he made himself manifest, relate to himself personally, or to them? Many, and perhaps most readers, consider these emblems as relative to the Jews, i. e., to the Church of which *they* then constituted the visible embodiment. But there seems to me an evident and regnant propriety in view of the context, in regarding them as bearing a closer relation to God himself; for himself was the subject of discussion, and his great object was to make such a representation of himself, and produce such impressions

respecting himself, as would inspire Israel with courageous and sustaining expectations. Accordingly, I feel constrained to look, not so much at the bush, as at the fire in the bush, and to consider that fire as an emblem of those high and inapproachable prerogatives to which God had appealed to show forth his capacities as a guardian and defender of his people. I look at the fire as an emblem of self-existence, as a symbol of the I AM, the uncaused, self-supporting power from which all things proceed, and by which all things consist. There is nothing above, or beyond such power; there is nothing by the side of it, or parallel to it; every thing else is infinitely beneath it —is at its very footstool; and by thus revealing himself to Israel, under that character by which he stands at the summit of the universe, and waves his sceptre over all things in heaven and earth, and hell, God gave the highest possible of sanctions to all his utterances, and encouraged a faith which no changes or chances, fates, fortunes, or vicissitudes could possibly disturb.

And now, do you ask *how* could the fire symbolize such infinite supremacy? a supremacy for our aspiration's most soaring reach, and for our faith's most stable confidence? Why, in this simple way. It was a fire which nothing occasioned, which nothing fed, which nothing kept alive. Its being in a bush, and, according to Josephus, in a thorn-bush, shooting out into the tenderest twigs, covered all over with leaves and flowers—the likeliest of all things to be withered by fire's slightest touch—and yet, while such, not

crisped, or wilted even, in the least degree—proved, to the most consummate demonstration, that the fire was one of which it could be said no earthly fuel—no such elements as we are conversant with—had kindled it, or cherished it, or prolonged its burning. And, as such, it was prodigy indeed—a prodigy which might confound Atheism itself; and enforce its belief in its greatest stumbling-block, an uncaused cause.

But it is singular, and worthy particular attention, that this is the very aspect of the matter which presented itself to Moses. Moses was no mean philosopher, as well as a great prophet. He "was learned in *all* (it is the express testimony of inspiration) in *all* the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and in deeds."[g] He had, doubtless, seen the tricks of Egyptian magic a thousand times, and was an apt subject, not for an illustration barely, but for a *philosophical* illustration of an attribute of God which no art could copy or invalidate. So God presented such an illustration to his experienced eye; and, as the result proved, Moses was drawn towards it instantly, with all the curiosity of a philosopher, and smitten with just that wonder which philosophy confesses to, when her conjectures are dashed and silenced by stubborn and indisputable facts. "I will now turn aside," he exclaimed, "and see this great sight, *why* the bush is not burnt;" or, more literally and precisely, "why the bush will not burn."[h] Moses, you perceive, enters into the spirit of *whys* and *wherefores*, almost like a

g Deut. xxxiv. 10; Acts, vii. 22. *h* Ex. iii. 3.

skeptical and prying unbeliever. Hume ought to have praised him for his philosophical temper, as much as Longinus did for his rhetorical sublimity.

There are other considerations, also, which induce me to think that the *fire*, rather than the *bush*, is the prominent emblem in this notable representation. The ground on which the emblem was exhibited became holy ground. God repelled the presumptuous curiosity of his servant, who would, perhaps, have thrust his hand into the blaze, to ascertain if it were a reality, or an optical delusion, like the mirage of the desert. "Draw not nigh hither," was his warning; "put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."[i] This indicated the personal presence of the Almighty, rather than a mere unrolling of a picture of his Church's destiny. The same peculiarity attended the place, where the flame shot up to mid-heaven from the heights of Sinai;[j] and here, as well as there, a voice is heard out of "the midst of the fire," betokening a speaker whose words are a fiat of life or death; who is "the head of all principality and power."[k]

But the personal presence of God, in this most curious scene, and its design to symbolize himself, rather than the Church—his power, rather than the Church's perils — seems to be rendered incontestable, by the allusion of Moses himself, afterwards, to "Him that dwelt in the bush,"[l] and by our Saviour's appeal to it, as a demonstration of God's su-

Ex. iii. 5. *j* Deut. iv. 11, 12. *k* Col. ii. 10. *l* Deut. xxxiii. 16

premacy over life—which is, beyond question, the highest of gifts, and which, unoriginated, is the loftiest of endowments. "And as touching the dead," said Christ to the skeptical Sadducees, "that they rise, have ye not read in the Book of Moses, how, in the bush, God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?"[m] "For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him."[n] With Christ, therefore (the surest of all interpreters), the approach of God to man under the emblem of an unkindled, unfed fire, was a demonstration of himself, as One who hath immortality, in the strict sense of the term; or, as St. Paul afterwards expressed it, "who only hath immortality," i. e. who only hath it in himself; and who, only and alone can give it or withhold it —can inspire life, or can extinguish it—can make a creature an inmate of that Paradise, where the river of water of life flows perennially and forever,[o] or can lay the axe to the root of the tree, and destroy both soul and body in hell.

And now, Brethren, to sum up what has been advanced, under this branch of our subject, can you conceive of any emblem so significant of a Power, which enjoys life underived, and can impart it at will, as a fire which nothing has kindled, and which burns, vigorously and luminously, without fuel for its flame to feed on? Fire unoriginated, is, to our apprehension, not only an impossibility, but an impossibility of

m Mark, xii. 26. *n* Luke, xx. 38. *o* Rev. xvii. 1, 2.

the most impracticable nature. We can scarce conceive of it. It is fire, not *ideally* alone, but *actually* in the abstract; and that is an affair which puts even imagination at defiance. What an emblem is such fire, then, of an unoriginated, self existent God—of an I AM, who was *from* eternity, and will live onward *to* eternity, the same unwearied, unwasting, independent one!

Still, while fire cannot enkindle itself, what imparts and multiplies itself more easily? And, here again, how perfect and exquisite the emblem, to illustrate God's power to impart and diffuse life, when it is his pleasure to communicate it. A touch enables a blaze to light up its counterpart. An impulse of the Divine will, an inspiration of the breath of the Almighty makes life mount upward from a heap of dust; and the clay which was a little while before an impassive statue, becomes man in the similitude of his self-moving Maker.

And such, then, was the matchless fire, which he that dwelt in the bush employed, as a symbol of his uncreated, unaided power and glory. The bush helped not that mysterious flame: not a twig, not a leaf, not a petal of its flowers, assisted to sustain its blazing brightness. Of course, such a flame might have burned perpetually, without reference to time. One day would have been with it like a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. And of a truth, self-existence knows neither beginning, nor ending, nor diminution. It is yesterday, and to-day, the same; and forever. It is an unsupplied, yet an unwaning fire. It is the miracle of miracles; it is the secret of

all secrets; it is the deepest of the deep things of God.

II.—And now, having reached the meaning of the sacred and awful symbol, under which God represented himself to Moses, in Mt. Horeb, we come naturally to its argument—its practical bearing and importance: primarily, of course, to the Israelites; and, secondarily, for our own selves.

Let it be granted, then, that it is the *fire* chiefly, and not the *bush*, which is emblematical, and that the unfed fire is a most impressive emblem of the Divine self-existence, the question presents itself, How could a revelation of this attribute of the Almighty have any peculiar pertinency to Israel, bowed down with affliction to the very dust?

It is indisputably evident, that God himself thought it had such pertinency, and expected Israel to remark it, and to dwell upon it; for he said to Moses, just after the revelation in question, and when Moses had entered upon the commission of duty which it authorized, "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the Name of God Almighty; but, by my Name Jehovah, was I not known to them."[p]

With God, then, with God himself, so that there can be no possible mistake or doubt on this point, a revelation of his Self-existence is a higher revelation than one of his Almightiness:—whence it follows, that to appeal to his self-existence, is to appeal to something loftier than Omnipotence, and to rely upon

[p] Ex. vi. 3.

it is to rely upon the strongest possible assurance which even Divinity itself can give.

We might not so have construed and measured Divine capacities. We should have seized, perhaps, upon an argument drawn from the Divine Omnipotence, as the most potential and upbearing of all others. If Omnipotence were on our side, we should have said that all was on our side which the universe could possibly supply, and that we might rest contented and secure.

But there is something further back, in the immensity of the Godhead, than even boundless power. There is that which is the basis, or substratum, or whatever metaphysicians are pleased to call it—essence, if the term suits them any better—there is that, I say, upon which every element of Deity falls back, and in which it may be said to find subsistence and support. And this is SELF-EXISTENCE, an attribute which looks to no outward cause for origin, or sustenance, or continuity. One can conceive, certainly, of Omnipotence, or a power seemingly Omnipotent, which may be communicated; which can accordingly be withheld, or terminated, or which will cease by its own inherent limitations. And so of Omniscience, or of a power apparently Omniscient. And still more so of wisdom, of holiness, of justice, and of mercy. Who, however, can conceive of communicated self-existence —an existence independent of God?[q] or who can conceive of any such existence, as subject to any superi-

[q] The Son has *the same* self-existence as the Father.—John, v. 26. Hence they are one in divinity.

ority, subjugation, or control? When, then, we reach self-existence, we reach what may be called the fundamental and profoundest element of the Godhead—the very sublimest, remotest, and mightiest of Divine capacities—the highest of things high, the greatest of things great throughout the universe, whether of matter or of mind.[r]

Now, if so, then what higher sanction is there, than an appeal to God's self-existence? What stronger assurance, than one which rests upon this attribute for its foundation? There is nothing beyond the I AM—there is nothing even in Divinity itself—more majestic, or more supreme, than is conveyed to us under this Divinest of Godlike appellations. And, if so, did not God reason logically, as well as graciously, when he intimated his expectations that a disclosure of his self-existence would produce an impression which a disclosure of his omnipotence had not done, and would strengthen and comfort the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as these patriarchs had never been strengthened and comforted by lower manifestations of his capacities to bless? Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew God only as one Almighty; by his Name, Jehovah—his Name of Self-existence—was he not known to them.[s] Their posterity, however, were about to know him as One in whom Almightiness resided at its utmost height, and by the securest tenure; for they were about to know him as the I AM, the self-existent Being, who was like none

[r] Bergier's Dict. art. Aséité, i. 233.

[s] Ex. vi. 3.

other, and to whom no other could be likened by any effort of imagination whatever. Oh, what a basis such knowledge for a confidence as unshaken as the rocks; as immovable as the great mountains; as steady as the pole! The bush, as an emblem of the Church's capacity for endurance, could not inspire such adamantine confidence as this. But with a lively emblem of God's self-existent guardianship and friendship, in full relief before her, to what loftiness of trust and fearlessness might not Israel rise! Thenceforward, might one say, she can give her terrors to the winds; for here is something which man has never enjoyed before, something which Divinity itself cannot surpass, which comes from the source of every other cause or capacity in the unbounded universe. Faith can have nothing more stable whereon to lean. If it cannot rest here, it can find a resting-place nowhere; and must be hopelessly and foolishly importunate. Let it hang, then, upon a self-existent God; and say with the Psalmist, while such a God is its reliance, "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble: therefore will we not fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof."[t]

"There is a river," continues the same inspired believer, and in a strain not less literally than beautifully true, "the streams whereof shall make glad the city

[t] Ps. xlvi. 1–4.

of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High." This river is the river of water of life, which flows clear as crystal, along the streets of the Celestial city, "proceeding," as St. John said, "out of the throne of God and of the Lamb."[u] And this river of life has its fountain in the hidden depths of the Divine Self-existence; since it is as a self-existent life that God is the originator and controller of all other life whatever. For life, as has been said to you already, is the highest of all gifts; and, when uncaused, the loftiest of endowments.

And, as such a Master and Lawgiver of life, how ought God, if Israel's friend, to have been her largest and sweetest consolation! Is there any thing which touches us more nearly, than that which touches life? any thing which ought to do so? Most unquestionably not. But if he who has *our* life in his keeping, and *all other* life in his keeping, be our friend, then what need we be anxious about, or alarmed for? Can any thing harm us essentially? Can even death, which seems to come nearer to robbing us of life than any thing beside, and which is denominated our king of terrors, and is accounted our last and bitterest foe? Let Christ be here our counsellor. See how he strives to fortify his disciples, in view of such a spoiler's worst and direst desolation. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him, which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."[v]

u Rev. xxii. 1. *v* Matt. x. 28.

But if we *do* fear him—if we do fear him with that confidence which is made up of reverence and gratitude, and hope, and filial love, then whom else, or what else need we fear, with that chilling apprehension which so often shakes man's frame, and spreads ashen shadows on his countenance? Suppose Israel to have so feared God as to have looked up to his self-existence (as it is) as the surest possible of all resting-places for our anxious aspirations in the hour of sorrow—need Israel have quailed or quaked one moment before the autocrat of Egypt, though he threatened her with all the combined mischiefs of earthly might and malice? Israel might have laughed Pharaoh to very scorn, if her life had been hid in God's bosom—put into the safe and inaccessible keeping of the self-existent Jehovah. To such a Being, life and death, in the ordinary acceptation of the terms, are the veriest accidents. They are no interruption to his plans. They hide no one from his sight. They deprive no one of his guardianship. All live unto him. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the departed patriarchs of Israel, whose very dust could not have been found, perhaps, when Moses was sent to tell his countrymen that God was speaking to them by a new name, and by his highest one—all these patriarchs were as much before God, and as safe with him as when they walked the earth with none of their eyes dim, none of their natural force abated.[w]

This very truth, and this great truth, it was one of

[w] Deut. xxxiv. 7.

the chief and blessed purposes of God's manifestation in the bush, to symbolize and to communicate. That the dead, even, are not dead to the everliving God, is, as our Lord assures us, one, at least, of the lessons to be read in the ethereal flame.

Now, it is hardly necessary to say that the same thing *might* have been realized, and the same thing *would* have been realized in the case of those who, with that faith with which the patriarch leaned upon the revelation of God's omnipotence, now leaned upon the grander revelation of his self-existence. And, if so, what more, or better, could Israel have asked in Egypt, than to know that "the good will of him that dwelt in the bush"[x]—the good will of him to whom all his true children live, and never die—the good will of a self-existent God, was hers? With that wall of fire round about her, she ought to have bid defiance to her oppressor, and to all his engines of woe and death, and looked serenely to the heavens. Slay me if you will, she might have said to him, with an unblenching firmness—slay me if you will, you can do no more. You did not give me life, and of life you never can deprive me. The true and only Author of life is my friend; and your enmity cannot separate me from his protection, or his love. Your utmost power is bounded by the grave; and from the grave to which you send me, I shall rise on angels' wings, to honor, to glory, and to immortality. Thither you and your minions of spite and torment can never

x Deut. xxxiii. 16.

follow. I can therefore treat your angriest menaces with pity and disdain.

And now, my Brethren, in concluding, let me say, that if *we* have not our Pharaoh to discipline us, and overtask us, we have the same vale of tears to travel through, which bruised the feet and saddened the heart of Israel; and *we*, therefore, may well fix our eyes upon the same source of consolation which was commended to her, in the holy, unfed flame that burned at the base of Horeb. Most certainly, that final end of all earthly calamities which dismayed and paralyzed Israel—an untimely death—may be not less dreaded by ourselves than it was by her, in her days of weariness and pain. I bid you, therefore, look to the emblem which brought before her, in wondrous vividness, the Source of all life, and the power which has all life in its keeping, now and for evermore. Make a self-existent God the object of your contemplations, your worship, your affections, and your hopes. In his hands your life will be like the unfed fire, come what will, and come when it may. Nothing can extinguish you, or despoil you, or scatter your very dust, if your life is hid with Christ in God. What are all common or conceivable calamities to him, who is above all causes, and the hidings of whose power no finite comprehension can approach? He holds the winds in his fist—what tempest can blow which will wreck you on the quicksands of perdition? He ruleth the seas, and the noise of their waves, and the tumults of the people—what surges of distress, what uproar of thronging foes, can

drown your cries for help, or dash in pieces the barque of your soul's fortunes? The Prince of the power of the air trembles at his nod; even the Devil himself cannot touch a hair of your Divinely guarded head.

O trust in God, then, who exists from, and of himself, and not in any human and perishable arm. Every other dependence will fail you. Every other expectation will disappoint you. Every other prop will sink beneath you. But they who trust in the self-living, ever-living God, shall ride triumphant over every obstacle. They shall mount up on wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; they shall walk, and not faint. The universe in arms against them would be powerless. They would reach the bosom of God in safety, through the chambers of death and the gates of hell. "For I am persuaded," said one, who knew the range of the power to which his soul was clinging, "For I am persuaded, that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."[y]

Oh, who would turn from such a hold as this, to totter about without a staff to lean on, till he tumbles into a hopeless grave!

[y] Rom. viii. 38, 9.

SERMON III.

HISTORY OF THE SOUL: ITS ORIGIN, NATURE, AND DESTINY.

"*And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.*"—Genesis, ii. 7.

It is a notorious fact, and one which has been often adverted to by scholars, that the greatest critic of antiquity applauded Moses, for his description of the creation of light. But if he had thought more of moral sentiment, than of rhetoric, he would sooner have applauded him for this text; in which he introduces the most marvellous of all the known creations of God—the creation of the human soul. Why, the *nature* of the human soul is a subject upon which the philosophers of antiquity (the philosophers of Egypt, Persia, India, Greece, and Rome) have expended their utmost efforts in vain;[a] so that when we read their fullest speculations, in the pages of Plato or Cicero, we are sometimes seized with amazement at their crudeness, or with absolute pity for their folly.

a Cicero's Tusc. Disp. i. 9, 10.—Pliny (bk vii. ch. 55) speaks of theories of immortality as "childish ravings."

Particularly they seem dumb and blind respecting any adequate conceptions of an answer to the grandest of all questions. What was the soul made for? I say the grandest of all questions; for evidently the soul, the sublimest of God's works in *our* world, must have been made for some supreme and God-like purpose. For example, one might ask, Was the soul made for itself alone? And the answer seems easy, that, considering its Maker, this were utterly impossible. But, again, one might ask, Was the soul made for mere selfish enjoyment? And such an idea would seem, in view of the same Maker, to be a solemn absurdity. Yet we know that the practice of millions, and of the intelligent, too, as well as the unlearned, has been, to regard the soul as if something wholly independent, which is to live and act for itself entirely. And we also know, that it has been the practice of as many millions more, to regard the soul as something which had no business to transact, but the pursuit of its own whims, and research for its own private enjoyment.

Now, while the wisdom of antiquity and the practice of later times demonstrate the fact, that the soul is a thing which it takes thousands of years to understand, here is a writer far away in the distant past—bordering on the flood (for Shem, the son of Noah, was alive during the long life of Moses, and died but some 20 years before him,)—here, I say, is a writer, who talks to us of the origin, nature, and destiny of the human soul, as if it were a thing much easier to describe than the great Ark, for he wraps up all he

has to say in a single sentence. And in that sentence, however brief, he tells us, with curious felicity, how the soul sprang into existence, what its character is, as an object of creation, and what the destiny it is designed to illustrate. O, if Moses spake not by inspiration, then philosophers and worldlings ought quite to worship him; for, after dealing with the soul, till this late day, they cannot tell us so much to purpose, in all their lucubrations, as he does in this one text. Here we have the soul's creation distinctly and graphically delineated—the body has nothing to do with animating it; it proceeds from God himself. In that act of creation, we learn, inevitably, the entire dependence of the soul upon God for life:—yes, that even the soul (self-existent as we fancy it[b]) has no life but from God's own lips. And, finally, we learn here, that the soul was not created asleep, stupid, earthbound, and insensate towards its Maker, but living—and, of course, instinct with just such life as it had emanated from—instinct with life Divine, and therefore destined and adapted to act out the purposes of such a life, in reflecting back the image in which it started upon the great career of being.

These are three momentous points, my Brethren, in the history of the human soul; and I can think of no page or text, since this of Moses, where so much of condensed and vivid truth will be found respecting them. May the Spirit, which taught him to suggest such topics, enable me to speak about them for your edification.

b Taylor's Plato, 4, 324, note.

I.—And, first, respecting the origin of the human soul.

It was observed to you, that the body had nothing whatever to do with originating the soul's animation. Now, it has been one of the nicest, and, apparently, most recondite of all points, which philosophers have sought to establish, respecting the soul and body, whether they are inherently distinct, and whether they can exist separately. You have heard, doubtless, of those who are called Materialists. These people believe that the soul is nothing but organized matter, exceedingly subtle and refined; something, indeed, like electric fire, or magnetic influence, or solar light; but still, after all, nothing but organized matter. A natural and inevitable result of such a theory is, that the soul, being matter, may be disorganized, as the body is, by death, and with the body be scattered and lost, if not annihilated. When Christians adopt this theory, (as some who profess and call themselves Christians do,) the result is, that they believe death to be an unbroken sleep, till the day of judgment; deny altogether an intermediate state, and look upon the promise respecting Paradise, made to the thief upon the cross, as one which the apostle Paul, though he might have experienced its blessedness *before* martyrdom, could not experience *afterwards*: Paul being at present, in their view, as if he had never been. The Socinian, (Dr. Priestly,) like many of his sect, was a theorist of this kind; and upon his death-bed informed his friends, that he expected to have no more consciousness until the morning of the resurrection.

But how completely is such speculation as this set at naught by the plain testimony of the great expounder of truth to ancient Israel! Can any thing be clearer, in his metaphysics, than that the soul and the body are two altogether distinct and independent things? God, as he informs us, makes the body *before* so much as a soul is known, or spoken of. "And God formed man of the dust of the ground." That is, he formed man's material part complete; or, to use Scriptural language, "perfect and entire, wanting nothing," so far as his material part only was concerned. There lay man upon his "lap of earth," as fully man, so far as his body only is concerned, as if he had been smothered in vigorous health, and nothing but breath were wanting to enable him to start up with his wonted self-command. But there he lay, too, as motionless, as prostrate, as powerless, as if death, his future enemy, had struck him down beforehand. There was no lustre in his eye, there was no thought brooding upon his brow, there was not so much of sound within his lips as the murmur of summer's lightest breeze in the whispering pines. All was as still and silent as the corpse made ready for its burial. And if nothing had been done further, all would have been stillness and silence, prolonged and deepened, till the exquisite conformation had crumbled back into its original confusion, and dust had been dust again.

This is clear and undeniable. But now, when *this* portion of his handiwork had been completed absolutely, lo! God returns to his task a second time.

The sacred writer represents him, majestic, infinite though he be, as contemplating his works, when finished; as smiling on and blessing them. "And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was VERY good."[c] Is it, then, presumptuous or irreverent, to suppose the Father of All leaning, as it were, from his high heavens, to survey the beauteous, the inimitable, but the impassive statue which had sprung forth, at his bidding, out of the loose and shapeless dust—that his countenance beamed ineffable complacency as he studied the matchless wonder—that he resolved to make it worthier and nobler still—that he kissed its cold and lifeless lips, and raised it up in glory, a similitude of his own celestial self? And did he not do this, when he breathed upon man's insensate clay, and endowed it with his own immortal inspiration—sent the vitality and activity of heaven warming and kindling through his frame, till man stood upon his feet, and looked up towards the countenance which beamed upon him, to answer light and smiles with their own reflections—looked up, and with his conscious, joyous, high-born soul, acknowledged and worshipped his father, God?

Oh, could we have stood by and beheld such a scene of marvels, when should we have ever doubted that the body and the soul are as distinct as the two worlds from which they spring—the world we tread upon, and the world above our heads, towards which we turn our faces when we worship the Source of all

c Gen. i. 31.

things! And feeling thus, how could we tolerate that philosophy which tells us that the grave is a long, or a changeless home, for all of mortal man!

But should you tolerate such philosophy aught the more, when the positive testimony of the great inspired recorder of man's earliest history enables you to realize such a scene as has been fancied—enables you to trace man's soul and body to two entirely separate sources and periods of creation? Then lay conjectures by, and take assurance from such a witness. Give up the dreams of speculation, and adopt the substantialities of faith. Faith has substance whereon to lean. It is not built, like an air-castle, upon shadows. It is things which may be hoped for, not guessed at merely, or imagined, which it anticipates. It can bear one up as buoyantly as *any* principle of human nature. Believe in God, believe in the breath of God, as the inspiration of human life;[d] and you can conceive of the soul as an object quite as separate, distinct, and real, as the body itself is to your outward senses. And with that faith, you will honor the soul as the workmanship of the Almighty; and will never listen for one moment to that absurd and self-degrading philosophy, which would teach you to compare yourself to a poor brute, and to expect no more hopeful grave than that in which a poor brute moulders into nothingness.

d Bichat's definition of life is, that it is an assemblage of functions which resist death. This, as Rennell says truly, is no definition at all. But it shows the lameness of philosophy. It can give us but negations. —Rennell on Scepticism, 6th edit. pp. 69, 70.

With that faith you can understand, in a moment, how the soul, which was created independently of the body, may exist *without* it, as well as *with* it. Then you will see how consistent it was for Christ, to promise the penitent upon the cross a refuge in Paradise, when his last sun was going down—how for Paul, to desire to depart and to be with Christ, *after* death, where he had been *before* with him; and, in fine, how it is no contradiction to speak of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as living still, since *all* (as our Saviour asserted to the unbelieving Sadducees, who would have death an everlasting sleep,) *all* live unto God. All? Then, our pious dead, at least, are not unconscious dead; and they who have departed in the true faith of God's holy Name must be our fellows still in life.

> Such friends, when dead, are but removed from sight,
> Hid in the lustre of eternal light.

Perhaps they now are hovering around us, and are our protecting angels. Angels carried Lazarus to the bosom of Abraham; and I see no impropriety in supposing, that those angels were such as had known and loved him best on earth, who could sympathize most deeply with his humility, and enter most largely into his triumphant joy.

II.—Our next topic, in view of the text, was to be the fact, that this description of the soul's creation represents it as dependent on God for the commencement, and, by natural implication, for the continuance of its being.

The soul is brought out into existence, according to

our text, by an immediate act of God. The body has nothing whatever to do in this high transaction. Neither does the soul suggest or fancy, much less accomplish, its own pro-creation. It is God, and God alone, who devises and achieves its introduction into life. So that this text most completely opposes and overthrows the imagination of those who are inclined to think that the soul is something which has existed *from* eternity, and, therefore, may exist *to* eternity, by a sort of inherent or self-sustaining energy.

There is no such doctrine in our text; there is no approach to it. The soul, as we are here taught, has a definite origin, as well as a distinct one. We can trace its beginning, as well as we can trace the beginning of the body. We can show how God's mind contrived and his will effected the one, as well, and as entirely, as the other.

So we ascribe the soul to his workmanship, as exclusively as we do the body. Both are his. Both are his, equally and completely. And if so, both are his, unceasingly and inalienably, for evermore.

Now, this is an important point, far more so than you may now be prepared to admit—far more so than even many theologians are wont to allow. For if it be true, that the soul is not only as equally and completely God's as the body, as unceasingly and inalienably, too, and that for ever, then it follows, that the very life of the soul is as dependent upon God as the life of the body; and that its actual immortality is no independent, or inherent immortality, but is as much under God's control, as what we call mortal life.

This is not the view which many take of the soul's immortality. They seem to regard that as something apart from Deity, as something stricken off from it, like a spark from steel—as a species of self-existence—as something, therefore, of which the soul may glory against God, with pride, or with defiance.

O, what an unfortunate apprehension of that greatest of Divine endowments—the endowment of existence! My Brethren, there is but one self-existence in the wide universe. There is but one fire, which, like the fire in the unconsumed bush, burns without any thing to feed it; and that springs up from the feet of him, who sitteth on Heaven's "great white throne" of perfect holiness. There is but one "I AM," above, below, or all abroad. And there can be but one such Being; for this prerogative of self-existence is the loftiest prerogative of the Godhead, and transcends all finite capabilities whatever. If shared, it makes its partaker an assessor upon God's own sovereign seat, and a portion of his own mysterious unity. Hence, when Christ said, Before Abraham was, I am, he claimed community with the Eternal One.[e] And thus did the Jews, who were no inexpert theologians, understand him; for they took up stones to slay him, on the spot, for the audacity of blasphemy.

All this is sustained and enforced by a striking text of the Apostle Paul, which many appear to find it difficult to comprehend. "Who only hath immortality,"[f] is one of the ascriptions with which he dignifies

[e] John, viii. 58, 59. [f] 1 Tim. vi. 16.

the Blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords. Yet, to this there is a seeming contrariety; for angels are immortal, and so are men, and so, finally, are devils. How, then, can God *only* have immortality? Why, in this simple, perspicuous way. He only has immortality, as an endowment, independent, underived, and indestructible. Or, as the great metaphysician Abelard expressed it, "God, who, viewed by the light of carnal reason, *is nothing*, IS *only*, in the true sense of the word."[g] All other beings have an immortality which began at a precise moment of time, and which can be terminated at any other precise moment of time, by the Power which permitted it once to be. All other beings, therefore, have a dependent, a derived, and destructible immortality. In a most essential and emphatical sense, then, God is the only immortal One. None can stay, or suspend, or hinder the current of his Being. His life flows onward, as it *has* flowed from eternity, without cause, without interruption, without end.

And it is this supremest of all prerogatives, by which he enjoys life without origination, and without support, that he controls all other life—controls its existence; and, of course, any element of that existence, as, for instance, its happiness. Hence, he is to us, under this aspect, the most dread and potential object of our fears. Accordingly, our Saviour appeals to this prerogative over life, when he would have us fear him by the most imperative sanction. "Fear

g Bernard's Life, p. 132.

him," said he, "which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."[h] Mark his phraseology; for a sect, called destructionists, sometimes refer to such language, to prove that God will actually destroy, i. e. annihilate, the souls, as well as bodies of the impenitent. Our Saviour speaks with logical precision. He does not say "who *will* destroy," but "which is able to destroy." His object evidently is, to illustrate, by the possibilities to which God's power may reach, that all possibilities, on this side of the most extreme one, are especially within the compass of feasibility. And it is, as if he had said, "I call upon you to fear One, who can actually destroy your soul; and who, therefore, can much more easily do a lesser work, make your soul languish in hopelessness and pain."

And to the same sort of conclusion, my Brethren, should our dependence upon God, for the soul's very life, bring our individual selves. I teach you that dependence, to make you apprehend more vividly, feel more sensibly, and be influenced by more energetically, the possibilities of final retribution. O, consider how helpless a thing the soul will be, under the scourges of that retribution, if he, who inflicts it, has your all, your absolute and universal all, your body and your soul, within an almighty grasp. Reflect, how boundless his capabilities to afflict either, who knows so well the most intimate secrets of the existence of both, that he can put both out of actual being —extinguish them in the impenetrable gloom of

h Matt. x. 28; Luke, xii. 5.

eternal annihilation. Men wonder, sometimes, how God can adjust his recompenses to the infinite variety of cases, which will be exhibited at the bar of final judgment. He knows how to use the body and the soul, as the potter does his lumps of plastic clay. He can assign millions to grades of honor, and millions to grades of dishonor; while each shall see the connexion between conduct and reward, as clearly as we can see shapes and adaptations in the potter's vessels.[i]

Ah, there will no mistakes be made by him who can raise human nature, as the incarnation of Christ demonstrates, to a partnership with himself, or sink it to the humiliation and chains of apostate spirits. Oh, hope, then, for every thing that is exalted, ye who would be what God delights in. Oh, dread, then, every thing that is abasing, ye who would be what he abhors. Heaven and hell, in such hands as his, are capable of every blessing, and of every woe. There is a life in the one, to whose sublimities no angel yet has soared. There is a death in the other, to whose depths no devil yet has sunk. O, tremendous Being, who canst thus mete out immortal destinies, have compassion upon the souls that thou hast made.

III.—I said that there was a third point of instruction, in our text, relating to the soul—one respecting

i Hume could not comprehend how all cases could be definitely settled, there are so many doubtful cnes—so many persons half-virtuous and half-wicked. Such a case as Solomon settled, would doubtless have puzzled the whimsical philosopher.—1 Kings, iii. 16-28. Yet, Solomon decided *instanter*. So God will decide, *instanter*, the far greater perplexities of the final judgment.

the objects for which it was created. It was thus proposed to you. The soul was not created asleep, stupid, earth-bound, and insensate towards its Maker; but living—and, of course, instinct with such a life as it had emanated from—instinct with life Divine, and, therefore, destined and adapted to act out the purpose of such a life, in reflecting the image in which it started upon the great career of being.

"And man," says our text, "became a living soul." O, in this short, but glowing description of the soul's destination, in view of him from whom it emanated, how much and what profound instruction! For if man could have the making of his own soul, how certain were he to have made it, as he now makes pictures or statues, as an object to be gazed at for its beauty, and to bring applause upon the genius which devised it. Or, if not so only, how equally certain were he to make it as something to seek selfishly its own advancement, and to forget its author—or, as something to be blind to all concerns but its own enjoyment, and to put duty, obligation, and loyalty quite aside, as affairs of no importance. But God creates not the soul, magnificent though the object be, to be looked at with empty admiration. He creates not the soul, amazing as its powers are, for independent, self-centering aims and ends. He creates it for activity beyond the sphere of selfish thought. He creates it for use, for high and holy performances, agreeable to his own promptings and demands. He creates it living—all alive—and he creates it for a liv-

ing God—for himself, the only true and living Divinity of the unbounded universe.

And the context supplies us with ample authority for all this statement. No sooner is man created with this living soul, than he is summoned to a life of positive and active labor. God prepares a garden, where, amid trees and shrubbery of endless variety and multitude, he shall find incessant occupation. He calls man into his presence, and informs him of his own expectations, with this scene in view; or, in the simple language of the sacred narrative, "The Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, to dress it and to keep it."[j] He placed beside him the tree of life, by which, in some mysterious sacramental way, the living soul should be sustained, refreshed, and invigorated, in the life with which it started upon its career of Divinely appointed industry. And he placed also by the side of him the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; that, with his duty blended with temptation, he should be put upon the great trial for which life was given him, to know whether that life should be confirmed to him, as when first imparted, for an unmingled blessing, or whether it should degenerate into one long-drawn woe.

For such living, then, was the soul created, for the destinies designated by its Maker, for the ends at which its Maker was aiming, for the purposes which its Maker expected to achieve by it. But, alas, we

j Gen. ii. 15.

know that this exquisite and gracious plan has been overturned and thrown prostrate. Man disappointed the expectations of his blessed Creator, and fell—fell from the high estate of living for his Creator's designs, and his Creator's glory, to the low and abject state of one who forgets, nay, thwarts and outrages, a Maker and a Benefactor. Man is no longer a living soul, in the sense of a soul living for its God—living for the Source of all life, living for such dignity and blessedness as he can impart and sustain. He is now a soul living for itself; living for this short life alone; living for its vanities, its gayeties, its gains, its exaltations, and its pride. So true is this, that it is related as one of the memorable things in the history of an ancient man of God (St. Bernard) that he put to himself, daily, the home question, "Bernard, Bernard, wherefore art thou here on earth?"[k] But go now to man, as you ordinarily find him, and ask him in ten thousand instances for what he lives; and in ten thousand instances will he surely tell you, that he lives for any thing but God, and God's holy will. Look at him, and you will see him trying to run, if it may be, out of God's sight; and congratulating himself when he may do that, of which he thinks God takes no special cognizance. Behold him living without hope, and without God, in the world. Mark him, amid deeds that he delights in, but which God detests, hugging, as precious and consolatory, the unnatural thought, that God has forgotten, that he hideth

k Life, pref. p. viii.

his face, that he will never see it. Follow him, and observe how he loves darkness rather than light, because his deeds are evil; and comes not to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. Search his heart, as you may to some extent, by the fruits which it produces, and see if the issues of life well up from its recesses. Oh, how deadly the procession which it engenders. "For, from within, out of the heart of men proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, knaveries, deceit, lasciviousness, envy, blasphemy, pride, foolishness"[l]—i. e. foolishness as to spiritual things—in other words, insensibility or infidelity.

And is this living? Is this a life which becomes that living soul, which God's own life-giving spirit breathed into man's impassive frame? This the life which the Lord and giver of our highest endowment expects, and will be contented with?—expects and will be contented with! Oh, my Brethren, would to God I could convey to your minds something of the aversion, the loathing, the fiery indignation, with which he who made souls to live for himself alone, beholds them blighting the whole plan for which he formed them, and converting into degradation and shame what he designed for honor, for glory, and for immortality. Could I do it, could I give you the faintest transcript of the abhorrence with which God must behold the spoilers and defilers of his hand's most precious workmanship below, you would not

l Mark, vii. 21. The Greek.

wonder, for one moment, that he should talk of eternal death as the retribution of such ministries of ruin. What, but death, can be the just recompense of him who has destroyed a life? What, but endless death, the recompense of him who has destroyed such a life beyond all remedy? Who deserves to live, that has made life one perpetual defeat of all life's true objects? Give such a being a second life, and he will but repeat, over again, with direr steadiness, the lesson he has already practiced. And thence it is, that God holds out no prospect for a repetition of the trial. "For if we sin wilfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries."[m]

O ye, who have turned your lives into any and all shapes and destinations, but the one grand one for which God gave life to the human soul—the shape and destination of living for himself, and the duties which he has revealed as his peculiar pleasure—behold your doom! You are never to be living souls beyond the grave. There you shall be known as dying souls, i. e., not annihilated souls, but literally souls of death —souls in which character, happiness, peace, patience, and finally hope, shall all be dead; and where nothing shall survive but what will minister to the soul's ignominy, horror, perturbation and remorse. It seems a mystery to multitudes, that death can be chosen rather

m Heb. x. 26–27.

than life, on this side of the grave. Yet, we know it is a dreadful possibility.[n] There is a possibility more dreadful still—the most dreadful of all possibilities to a conscious spirit—the choosing death rather than life for eternity, rather than be thrown headlong into that bottomless abyss, where the lost soul takes its final plunge. That possibility is before you, right before you *all*, who are living to defeat the end for which God made you. O, be startled by its unutterable, indescribable calamities! O, despise not, wonder not, perish not. Perdition is intolerable, dream about it as you will. Who can dwell with its devouring fire? who can inhabit its everlasting burnings?

n Rev. ix. 6.

SERMON IV.

PROVIDENCES OF GOD IN THE HISTORY OF NAAMAN.

"*Now Naaman, captain of the host of the King of Syria, was a great man with his master, and honorable, because by him the Lord had given deliverance unto Syria: he was also a mighty man in valor, but he was a leper.*"—2 Kings, v. 1.

THE spiritual truths, illustrated by God's providence, are not less really and not less powerfully illustrated in low stations, than in high ones; but they are not so to ordinary human discernment. We are impressed by station, as well as by the truth enforced by station; and truth which comes from a lofty source, in our view, seems to come with superadded weight. A truth illustrated in the experience of those who stand near thrones, and possess the ear of majesty, is one of the greatest consequence and influence to us, who are "of the earth, earthy." This is the reason why the Bible gives us such a case to assist its holy lessons, as we find recorded in the chapter opened by our text. Naaman, the leader of Syria's hosts, the great, the honorable, the valorous deliverer of his country, is an almost infinitely higher subject to illus-

trate the lessons of God's discriminating and disciplining providence, than a beggar Lazarus, whom the dogs were left to pity; though such a beggar might be, as Lazarus was, a candidate for Abraham's bosom, and the other, in close peril of perdition. Therefore, we have the subject presented in a way suited to our preferences and prejudices; and let us not forget it, Brethren, when appealed to by a case which, with us, is among the foremost. I am to call your attention to the action of God's providence, in the history of one of this world's most elevated characters; one who, whether we consider his office, his influence, his dignity, or his power—every thing nearly which *we* venerate—which makes a saint in the calendar of earthly glory, was hardly with a superior in his eventful times. Receive it, then, with the reverence due to it, on your own worldly principles and prepossessions. It comes to you with all the sanctions which all that you think great can surround it. And now, having appealed to you by so much *below*, which can make my subject influential, I have only to add, may a blessing from *above* give it access, not to your understandings only, but your hearts.

I. This subject illustrates God's power in reducing, or allaying, the highest worldly prosperity.

Naaman embraced in his fortune about as many elements of earthly prosperity, as the human heart could well desire. He occupied the foremost military station, in an age when military distinctions surpassed all others, as well in their emoluments and prerogatives, as in their glitter. He that wielded the sword

in Naaman's day, virtually wielded the sceptre too; for we find that Naaman's was the hand on which royalty leaned, even when it bowed before an idol. Much more, then, did it lean upon him to fight its battles abroad, and administer its empire at home. And the text fully authorizes this supposition. He was a great man with his master; nor so only, but honorable. That is, even royalty revered his capabilities, and decorated him with dignity, rank, and their natural accompaniments, wealth and splendor. He was looked upon as his country's very prop and stay, "because by him the Lord had given deliverance unto Syria." So, doubtless, the flattery of the throne was echoed by the people; and whithersoever he went, the shout of acclamation and the song of eulogy followed his steps. To complete the whole, ample testimony is borne to his dauntless courage, "he was also a mighty man of valor." From which we may readily infer, that his personal strength and bearing fully corresponded to his elevation; and in an age when such things were prodigiously accounted of,[a] made his very eye and voice subjects for popular awe. We may gather something of the effects of his personal presence, from the manner in which his servants addressed him, when he bounded away in a rage from "the door of the house of Elisha." They did not say as Gehazi, My master. They speak to him with the trembling diffidence of little children, and called him "father."

Now, from such representations, it is easy to ima-

[a] Æneid, iv. 10–11.

gine, that in respect to every thing which earth could give him, Naaman was on one of the loftiest pinnacles of human existence. Did he want rank? the noblest of earthly dignities was all but his; and, virtually, it was his entirely. Did he want distinction? he was smiled upon, alike by the monarch and the crowd. Did he want wealth? he could roll in it, if he had the propensities of a miser, for his bare equipments for a journey were "ten talents of silver, and six thousand pieces of gold, and ten changes of raiment." Did he want fame? he was applauded, far and wide, as the deliverer of his country. Did he want his very person commanding? his valor made all hearts quail, when they saw the arm which could brandish a resistless sword.

But all would not do—all was no more to him than vanity and vexation of spirit. Rank, and distinction, and wealth, and fame, and the fawning terror of his associates and servitors, could neither satiate nor appease his craving soul. He was a leper! Defilement and corruption clothed him as with a garment; and whithersoever he went, he felt as if the curse of degradation hovered over him with its contagious horrors. So his life of outward glory was one of acute and corroding inward misery. Yet with how slight an interposition, on the part of the Almighty, was this effected! God hideth his face, and we are troubled. He but looked *away* from Naaman, while all the earth was looking *towards* him, and that pestilence, which walks unseen, touched him with its attainting fingers, and covered him with foul pollution. A miracle only

could then heal him; and he saw nothing before him but a grave, into which he should hasten down so loathsome a wretch, that his very kindred would shrink from the contamination of his coffin. No wonder that his days and nights were but one dreary round of woe—the more intolerable from the very splendors which seemed to mock his agony.

And should not this convince us, how fully and thoroughly all which this world can bestow upon us, is in the hands of God to convert it into a blessing or a curse; and how carefully and reluctantly we should allow ourselves to place strong affection on things which can so easily be transmuted into elements of wretchedness? We toil and grasp after the possessions, the honors, the emoluments, the immunities, which earth can yield us, with an eagerness which never sleeps nor tires. We rise up early, and we sit up late, and we eat the bread of sorrows for them.[b] We pawn life and salvation for them; when, though we miss not our aim, as thousands do, and succeed, as one in thousands do, like Naaman, God's power is above us still, and can reach us as effectually as ever, though we get so high as, in the imagery of the prophet, to exalt ourselves like the eagle, and build our nest among the stars.[c] One inevitable regret, one carking care, one hopeless loss, one gnawing disappointment, one blight of our persons like Naaman's, one thorn in the flesh like St. Paul's, can spoil our every acquisition, and render us, in feeling and in joy,

b Psalm cxxvii. 3. *c* Obediah, 4.

as poor and pitiable as the veriest abject whom the proud would spurn or spit upon. See, Brethren, see how God can mar and ruin the world for us, though we acquire heaps of its longed-for gains, without hastening us into scenes of retribution—yea, on this side of an untimely grave. And, I believe, he does so, in ten thousand cases which mankind call fortunate; since never yet saw I a contented worldling.[d] Worldlings are reaching forward and clutching after something future, as greedily as ever, though you place them on the towers of glory and pile millions beneath their feet. The curse of insatiable appetite clings to them, and persecutes them, till they die; and they die at last like drowning men, catching at very straws. Oh! why not moderate our eagerness for things which, though honey to the taste, have all the bitterness of death in the digestion. Why not remember the only wise council, and the only sure promise in respect to any temporal acquisition, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all things shall be added unto you."[e] "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal."[f] The world, if you seek *that* first—the world, if you treasure up what that alone can bless you with, may be a curse to you even before you die; and rob you, beside, of eternal blessedness. O, then, give your faith and love to a God who will never prove untrue—to a heaven that never will deceive.

d Horace, Sat. lib. i. 1, 38–40. *e* Matt. vi. 33. *f* Matt. vi. 20.

II. Our subject illustrates the fact, that what we consider our heaviest misfortunes, often turn out to be essential mercies.

Naaman chafed under his contaminating disease, and might have fretted himself with double haste into a leper's shunned and dreaded grave. But that which was like death to his worldly pleasures and worldly hopes, was ultimately the life of his immortal soul. His soldiers bring crowds of captives to his stately halls, and from one of the most insignificant among them he hears of a distant minister of religion, who could bless him with that which neither gold can buy, nor skill command. He hies him away to that minister's abode. But when there, though neither misinformed respecting the man of God, nor his unearthly gifts, his pride came near sending him back, no less a leper, and no less a pagan, than before. Naaman was as haughty as his station, his acquisitions, and his personal prowess might naturally render him. And the prophet, as the messenger of a King of kings and Lord of lords, treated him as a haughty worldling —who thinks God's servants are his servants, too— might be lawfully treated. He acted the part of a superior—would not so much as accost him, personally, but dispatched a menial to tell him he might wash seven times in the Jordan, and be clean. The lordly and imperious courtier was stung to the quick, to find himself, who had been accustomed to the cringing of a nation, addressed with such scanty ceremony; and he was turning from the door of the man of God, with one of those ebullitions of fury which the chag-

rined and vexed of this world's great ones so frequently, and with such utter sacrifice of dignity, give way to. And had he not had wiser and kinder attendants than such persons are usually blessed with, he would have stormed and blasphemed to his own everlasting detriment. But Heaven had marked him for its own; for, impulsive though he might be, he seems to have possessed a placability to which the great are generally strangers. He could be appeased and reasoned with, after a moment's paroxysms; and his attendants were, doubtless, familiar with this point in his character, or they would not have wasted on him their wise and most respectful expostulations. Naaman paused, relented, submitted, obeyed the man date of his Maker's messenger, and obtained the reward so often and so freely bestowed upon the humble, of finding even the Highest Being in the universe considerate of wishes indulged with lowliness. And, with the soundness of his body, there came, too, something infinitely better—soundness of mind and susceptibility of heart. The dipping in the Jordan was a baptism of his soul, as well as body—was a baptism of grace, as well as of consecrated water. The Spirit hovered over Jordan's wave, as when, on a later and more memorable occasion, "all righteousness," i. e., all duty, was scrupulously, and submissively, fulfilled there; and he went up from the water, not with the flesh only, but with the temper—the soft and pliant temper of a little child. And then, as he departed on his way, rejoicing, how did a new light dawn upon his mind, respecting the dispensation which had made

him, apparently, a wretched and a hopeless sufferer! He then saw, that but for his once execrated leprosy, he had never gone to the only right source on earth, for a blessing to his body or his soul, and might have died, not in the corruption of disease only, but in the deeper corruption of an unsanctified heart—and died, therefore, without hope for an hereafter, as well as without comfort here. And, finally, I doubt not, he blessed his leprosy far more than he had ever blessed his fortune; and thanked God for it as a benefit, beyond rank, or wealth, or fame, or peerless valor.

And so, my Brethren, may it be with us. The grievous misfortunes, as we consider them, which overtakes us and annoy us, in the midst of coveted prosperity, are not intended by God as deprivations merely, or as downright punishments. Probably, we are thinking too much and too highly of what this world may enrich us with; and God gives sometimes a sharp and sudden turn to our reflections, to direct them to himself and to eternity. O, how easy to forget him, to forget accountability and destiny, and all that is immortal, while the senses are entranced in this world's intoxicating dreams! And if he turn this world into a comfortless home, to induce us to seek an everlasting and ever-joyful one—shall we charge him with severity? Rather let us bless his corrections, though they cut ties which make our hearts bleed. The loss of all the world, if we possessed it, were a trifle, if our souls went not to wreck in the disaster. A lost world could be replaced, like a drowned one emerging from the vasty deep; but the

redemption of the soul is precious beyond all price, for, if once it slip from us, it ceaseth absolutely forever. Mourn not, then, for any thing, which constrains you to look away from earth to heaven—from man to God—from time to that changeless state where time shall be no longer. The last glance you ever bestow on earthly things, will be bright and beaming, if it assures us that your losses here have taught you to lay treasure up on high, and that though maimed, or halt, or blind, or poor in man's eye, you are going with a heart sound in faith, and full of holy love, into the presence of the Judge of quick and dead. O mortal, who canst so die, your death will be an unspeakable blessing; while he who dies otherwise in a palace, may go from a couch of gold and purple to lay down in flames.

III.—Our subject illustrates the fact, that as a solitary outward defect may render us degraded in the eye of man, so a solitary inward one may render us degraded in the eye of God.

Nothing oftener perplexes and provokes worldly-minded men, than to discover the Bible so positive, so extremely and unbendingly positive, in saying, that there are but two sorts of people in the world, God's friends and his enemies, his children and aliens from him. And when it speaks of the crisis of death, and the decisions of the final judgment, the same positiveness continues, and continues to encounter their opposition, and even denunciation. So strenuously hostile are multitudes to this peremptory exactness of the Bible, that even a Church gives way to it, like

the Church of Rome; admits that men often occupy a sort of middle ground, die in a sort of middle character, neither decidedly holy nor decidedly impious, and so provides a lurid purgatory to burn this inequality away, and bring all the doubtful safely to heaven at last. And this difficulty or obliquity in our moral vision, is well known to the Searcher of hearts; for we find him forewarning mankind by his prophet Malachi, that a period at length shall come when dim eyes shall see straitly and truly. "Then shall ye return, and discern between the righteous and the wicked; between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not."[g]

But there is many a hint in the Bible, which ought to enable us to pierce through all the perplexities of this subject, long before a day of retribution. Our text is one of them. We here perceive how easy it is for *us*, notwithstanding a multitude of circumstances (for *us*, I say, short-sighted as we sometimes admit ourselves to be, when moral questions are examined), to comprehend how, amid much that might induce us to regard one as outwardly stainless, even to human eyes, he can be as attainted and abhorrent as the lowest and most squalid victim of poverty. And, now, why should it not be as easy for God to see that true, respecting an *inward* state, which we ourselves can see true in an *outward* one? Naaman's rank, and splendor, and lofty bearing, could not hide his leprosy from the eye of man. Our show of virtue cannot hide

g Malachi, iii. 18.

from God the leprosy of the soul. Man looketh on the outward appearance, but God looketh on the heart. Think not, then, self-deceiver, by the encouragement of an apparent doubtfulness, or middleness of character among men, to escape God's all-discerning eye and God's all-enduring retribution. By the precise state of your heart, and not by the plausible array of your life, will he judge you, by the motives, and not by the gloss of your actions. He knows whether, or not, you have ever been born again. He knows whether you love *him*, or yourself and the world best—he knows whither your secret, most secret preferences tend; and by the condition of your innermost soul will he put you on trial at his awful bar. You may be—you may have been, fair enough to keep the world at bay, but you shall not prevent his entering the darkest corners of your mind, and bringing every absconding thought into transparent detection; and not by the bare words your lips have uttered, but by the meanings of those words, after the prompting of your thoughts, shall you be justified or condemned. O, trust not what you are to man, who cannot penetrate your bosom to see whether your heart be leprous—trust not your own breast, for there is a deceiver there, matchless among his tribe—trust not to flattery or self-justification, for your support in the day which shall try your hidden and lurking spirit. For "there is nothing hid which shall not be manifested, neither was any thing kept secret but that it should come abroad."[h] When that time comes, the

[h] Mark, iv. 22.

universe shall see a disease of the soul as plainly as you can now that worst of all diseases, which defiles the surface of the body; and by the melancholy sight, will justify, willingly or unwillingly, the awards of that tribunal which will fix your immortal doom.

IV.—Lastly, our subject illustrates the fact, that a *single* cause of helpless misery is enough to produce consummate wretchedness.

Had Naaman been expelled from office—had his master turned from him in coldness, to other candidates for his favor—had he been stripped of his wealth and honors, accused or suspected of cowardice, and upbraided as the bane of his country, we might easily conceive how, under such a complication of mischiefs, he should pine, give himself up to despair, and sullenly die. But, behold him wasting with regret, though not one of these calamities assails him, or hangs over him! There is deep significance in the place, to which the sacred historian assigns the testimony to his bodily pollution. He puts it last, as though to show that all which preceded was a very nothing, while this terminated the account—as if a cup full of sweets was not worth the drinking, while such a dreg of bitterness lay at its bottom. And, questionless, his disease was such an alloy to all Naaman's glories, distinctions, and gains, that, as a crown upon the brow of an enslaved monarch, it was coals of fire upon his head. He was persecuted by it night and day, in camp and in court, in public and in solitude. He could not fly from it, unless he could fly from himself; and often, probably, would have exchanged all

his acquisitions for the blooming health of peasants, whom he encountered in such lonely wanderings, as a mind, fretted as his was, is apt to covet, like banished spirits roaming through dry places. "Naaman," said he to himself a thousand times, "thou art the captain of Syria's host, thou art great and honorable, thou art the deliverer of thy country, thou art a mighty man of valor—but—but—thou art a leper! Oh, that thou mightest be the humblest of thy menials, to be free from the corruption under which thou art rotting away into a hideous grave!" But his repining wishes would have been as fruitless, Brethren, as if whispered to the winds, save for the gracious interposition of an unasked Providence.

And can one single source of helpless misery thus waste and blast the soul's enjoyment, on this side of the grave, amid all which this world can supply, to alleviate and lessen it? O, then, beyond that grave, where all this world's resources will be clean shorn off, and where every element of misery will be a gnawing worm and a consuming fire, how terrible, how unutterably terrible, the condition of a lost transgressor! Misery will be without him and within him, and above him and around him; his own self, his own chief woe, his memory full of burning recollections, his conscience of inflaming accusations, his very mind and soul on fire with the furies of remorse. O God, what a fate awaits thine enemies! And who, then, can rise up against thee, and thy anointed Son, saying (that they may wear the livery of this world) "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away

their cords from us."[i] Madness, yea, madness which the cells of the lunatic can not equal, is in their hearts, who are allowing those hearts to contend against thy law and against thy love. Well, well does a prophet exclaim to them in thy name, like one screaming to those about to rush down an unseen precipice, "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?"

i Psalm ii. 3.

SERMON V.

GOD'S USES OF EVIL BEINGS.

FROM THE PSALTER.

"*Slay them not, lest my people forget it; but scatter them abroad among the people, and put them down, O Lord, our defence.*"—Psalm lix. 11.

ALTHOUGH the Psalmist here prays, that the sword of retribution may not be drawn against some who were hostile to himself, or to the cause he represented; yet it is clear, from the latter half of the verse, that he thought they deserved its blows, and presumed Heaven might think so, too. He implores Heaven to spare them; yet not on their own account, but that, as monuments of discipline, they might quicken and refresh those easy memories of ours, which are so apt to forget any thing in the shape of chastisement, and let us run on in sin, as if God never could avenge.

And, in one respect, when we look at many of the worthless—or the truth-hating and opposing of mankind—*we* seem to resemble him. We look at such persons—in themselves considered—and we wonder

that they are spared to cumber the ground, while those who are most valuable, and most endeared to their friends, and to society, are cut down and hurried away. We are astonished, often, that such are not slain by the hand which parts the thread of life, while those rather are taken, of whom we are ready to say, with all possible fervency, "Oh, slay them not!"

But, herein, we differ from the Psalmist, who was what might be called, not a political, but a religious economist. He contemplated evil men, not so much with a reference to their personal deserts, as to the possible good ends they might, indirectly, subserve; and so he supplicated Heaven not to destroy them suddenly and irreparably, but to preserve them as warning beacons to the half-good, or the halting and wavering, that with such lively remembrancers before their very faces, they can be kept nearer the strait line, more securely within the narrow path of duty to the soul and God. He would not have them swept off like chaff from the threshing-floor, lest the memory of their fate go with them. He would have them restrained, yet so as to render them living and monitory testimonies, that there is a God who can avenge his servants and his cause; and who will bring into judgment all who dare follow their sad example. "Slay them not, lest my people forget it."

To some, my Brethren, this may be a singular, not to say, startling picture. A good man praying for the wicked, that they may be warnings to keep those in the right way who have begun to walk in it, or to de-

ter wanderers who may be thinking it not unsafe to let that right way be long disregarded. Yet it must be a picture acceptable to God, or he would not allow it to stand upon the records of inspiration. And, if so, it ought to be a vindicable one; and it becomes my duty to prove it such, or, at least, to make the attempt, God giving me the ability. I propose, therefore, to point out to you some subjects, with which such a picture is more or less obviously connected, and to show you, in their illustration, how such a sentiment as the text puts forward lies at the bottom of some of the profoundest principles of a broad and majestic religious economy. We must look at such a text, my Brethren, with no narrow, personal views, but in the spirit of a candid and comprehensive philosophy; and then we can enter into something of its width and reach. If we look at it in a contracted way, it will only serve (as the preaching of profound sentiments in religion often serves, with the ignorant and the envious) to set us a carping.

With these remarks as a guide, I beg you to notice, in the first place, how this text bears upon one of the most difficult topics in all the Psalter, and one of the frequent vexations of theologians themselves.

I. That topic is the subject of religious imprecations.

Too many, by far too many, who read the Psalter, and profess to be shocked by the spectacle of a good man imprecating the judgments of the Almighty on the heads of the wicked, presume he does this as a private individual, and querulously ask, how the in-

dulgence of such terrible feelings is consistent with the amenity, compassion, and charity, which true religion, beyond question, inculcates. They forget when they do so, that it is one of the simplest and commonest of facts in civil society, for a man to bear two characters —a private and an official one; and that he may be called upon in the latter, to say and to do things, which are quite incompatible with his station as a simple individual, and not a little painful to his feelings. If an attorney for the commonwealth, and a judge upon the bench, were to assail a fellow creature in language of frightful emphasis—the one exerting his utmost to show he was worthy of the gallows, and the other formally devoting him to this tremendous death, and were to do all this in their bare capacity as men, we should say, forthwith, that this was a most noisome, not to say appalling, exhibition of malignity. They do this, as official individuals do it, with intense zeal and solemnity, and we believe their hearts no whit less tender for their awful ministries; nay, give them full credit for the performance of their acts, as if prompted by no ill feeling towards the wretched culprit before them, but by a most patriotic anxiety for the welfare of the community at large.

The press, which is, of course, a fiction for individual men, putting their opinions down in black and white, for the information of multitudes, sometimes lashes public characters and public assemblies, with a perfect whip of scorpions; and when we are persuaded its sting is well deserved, and not instigated by secret malice, we absolutely thank Heaven, that

there is a tribunal before which we can arraign gambling financiers, tricky politicians, or a selfish government, and administer a chastisement scarcely inferior to the old custom of scourging a felon at the public post. And so far are we from pitying such sufferers, that we can see their brazen audacity writhe under torture, and begin its first works of justice and rectitude in an agony of repentance; and can do it with a complacency, which the pleasures of a banquet cannot rival.

Well, my Brethren, if we thus acknowledge (as we most indubitably do) that men in civil office, or as censors of the public morals, may say and do things in their public capacity, which, if they were to say and do in their capacity as individuals, we should pronounce unjustifiable, cruel, or malicious, why can we not as easily make the same distinction, in respect to what may be done by men in religious office, or as censors of the highest and most dread assumptions, censors not of overt conduct only, but of the thoughts and intents of the heart? Nay, do we not tacitly make this distinction, by coming into this house of God, and listening to your preacher, while he says to you officially, things which, if he were to say to you unofficially, you would, perhaps, account insufferable? He says to you, for instance, that human nature is dismally corrupt—is smitten with a moral disease, as attainting as leprosy to the body—that it is in danger of death, of death everlasting and irreparable; and you endure the formidable message, because you esteem it the dictate of imperious duty, and not of hos-

tility to you as individuals. He could not, in some respects, say worse things of you than he does; and if he said them, as some are inhuman enough to fancy he does say them, out of his heart as a man, he would merit, and he would not shrink from, your severest reprobation. But he says those things under a solemn sense of duty to God, and not because it is pleasant to say them (may the Lord have mercy upon the hard-hearted fault-finder, who can ever suppose it is pleasant to tell people how bad they are, instead of how good they are); and those who know what duty is what responsibility, what the dread reckoning of a future day, do him (I will not say the *kindness*) the *justice* to believe, that what is said, is uttered under strong constraint, and indicates no lack of consideration, or of sensibility, or charity.

And now, why cannot the same distinctions, with which we are familiar in society and in the Church, be carried into the Scriptures, and explain such ostensible harshness and proscription, as is often thought to be exhibited in what are styled *the imprecations?* David was a man, but he was also a public man—a public man in the widest sense, in state and Church; for, while the Old Testament calls him, over and over again, a king, the New Testament calls him a patriarch.[a] As chief governor in the Church, and in the state also, he might and he did utter, and pray for, things, which, if he had uttered them and prayed for them, as a mere man, might well have deserved censure, and censure without abatement.

a Acts, ii. 29.

Sometimes (as we might think unfortunately) his action as a public character, the *most* public character of his times, is left to be inferred; and we hastily attribute his language to him as an individual, and show him no mercy. Sometimes, this action is interpretable by his words, as in our text. Here, his reference to the community demonstrates, that he was swayed by his regard to the public weal, and not by his private interests, or personal feelings. "Slay them not, lest *my people* forget it." My people, i. e., the welfare of his people, is, you perceive, the governing motive of his appeal to Heaven. If he had been actuated by personal malignity, he would not have desired that his enemies might be longer left alive upon the earth, to be his annoyances and persecutions. Oh, no! He would rather have had them swallowed, as Pharaoh was, by the billows, or Korah by the gaping earth. But for himself he cares not. He is willing, nay, anxious, so that God permit them not to trample upon truth and righteousness, to let them remain for the admonition of the heedless; and to assure them that their quarrel with Heaven is as bootless as it is perilous.

David was not, was never, vindictive as a simple individual. His repeated mercy towards his most sanguinary foe, establishes this beyond a contradiction. And when he does utter his feelings in the Psalms, as an individual, mark how almost the tenderness of St. Stephen for his murderers breathes through his pathetic lines. "They rewarded me evil for my good, to the great discomfort of my soul.

Nevertheless, when they were sick, I put on sackcloth, and humbled my soul with fasting, and my prayer shall turn into mine own bosom. I behaved myself as though it had been my friend, or my brother: I went heavily, as one that mourneth for his mother."[b] Oh, when a man of such a frame as this denounces, let us never believe he does so, because of private preferences; but because the inevitable constraint of duty exacts the language of solemn or stern authority.

Thus, my Brethren, I hope may be vindicated those formidable imprecations of judgment, which, not infrequently, appear in the Psalter, and even elsewhere in the holy Scriptures. Nevertheless, if the *language* of such addresses to a righteous and avenging God may thus be justified, some, perhaps, will say the *object* of them may be questionable, and esteem it hardly right to employ the wicked for such ends, as those addresses may contemplate. For example, they may say, in reference to the case cited in the text, Would it not be better to slay the wicked outright, rather than harass and oppress them by visible punishments, for the benefit of lesser offenders, or of those who are in danger of tripping in the paths of propriety? This brings us to a second topic, suggested by the text, viz., The lawful uses of punishment.

II.—What, then, can make retribution justifiable?

It is a principle of human economy, that punishment should be administered, not for the sake of vengeance, but of reformation, if possible, to the actually guilty;

[b] Ps. xxxv. 12, 14.

certainly of reformation to the yet unconvicted, and of prevention to those who are tempted, and in peril of falling. The whole machinery of the administration of law towards offenders, goes upon such a principle; for our courts are open, our prisons are conspicuous, and executions, till they became hazardous, were as notorious as newspapers, and hand-bills, and broad daylight, could anywise make them. To criminals themselves, all this is martyrdom or purgatory, a heavy and a terrible addition to sufferings, which one might suppose sufficient to satiate the vengeance of the law (if it *were* vindictive) to the very uttermost. But the grand argument, nevertheless, has been and still continues to be urged, that the effects of a violation of law cannot be made too palpable, that others may hear or see, and thus fear, like catastrophes, if as wilful or presuming.

And what is this, my Brethren, but enacting, and countenancing, and maintaining the same thing in one shape, which we find God doing in another. God desires not to punish for his own satisfaction's sake; as tyrants have done, for offences coming under the old title of lese-majesty.[c] When the punishment of the wicked, in that point of view, is brought up before him, he (if one may say so) shudders, and turns away from the spectacle, as if almost as abhorrent to him as the loathsomeness of sin. "As I live, saith the Lord God," he swears it, you see, with the solemnity of an oath, by his eternity, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked;

c Kriegel's Corpus Juris Civilis. Dig. 48, 4; or, vol. i. 894, 895.

but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"[d]

And, in consistency with such a representation, God here prompts David to pray that the wicked may be half-slain, if so be that the issue shall be a benefit, not to themselves alone, but to such as their fate may admonish and restrain. Putting them down from the high places of pride and temporal success, of immunity and honor, might fill their minds with anguish, their bodies with the ailments and pangs which mental anguish can engender. But this deposition might save the very souls to which it was a scourge, while it saved others, also, who witnessed its lessons, from the curses of fortunate ambition. If Pharaoh had not hardened his own heart directly, while the discipline of God—which was intended to soften—indirectly hardened it also, (a result which a misused mercy always produces,) who can say, that the plagues of his people had not been blessings, rather than maledictions? Would they not have been accounted blessings by the thousands who followed the mad victim of infuriate passion, and who perished hopelessly beneath the angry billows of the returning sea? Oh, as that thronging host sank like lead in the mighty waters, would they not have accounted those plagues the very richest mercies, could they have averted from them a fate so direful to themselves, to their homes, to their whole nation? Pharaoh was not slain for many a day of wearisome forbearance, that he and his people might

d Ezek. xxxiii. 11.

not forget a clearly-predicted issue.[e] They were put down, but not annihilated, that they might not forget One, who held the elements in his grasp, and could muster all nature, if he chose, in array against his infatuated enemies. The lesson, as in ten thousand other instances, and as now, in instances fresh in recollection, was an inefficacious and a lost one. But what then? Would we have God more summary? would we have him slay without hesitation at the outset? Yes, such is our perverse misconstruction of the economy of moral government—its forbearance, and endurance, and fruitless hopes. That government graciously hesitates to punish, and we exclaim, How tardy! It punishes at last, with reserved and outraged justice, and we exclaim, How unforgiving!

My Brethren, you may thus perceive that the government of God, like the very governments which we ourselves constitute, and profess so much to admire and reverence, as the production of our highest skill and wisdom, would always, rather than avenge itself, constrain the evil to do better, and the, as yet, mostly tempted to be evil to abstain from yielding to seductions. May I be allowed to hope, that the remarks now made will, possibly, give you a fairer view, and a better understanding of its punitive administration than you have sometimes been inclined to entertain? If so, then you may be not unready to go a step further, and contemplate, with serious wisdom and untimidated candor, the last thought which I now feel it to be my duty to impress upon you—the uses of punish-

e Compare Exod. xiv. 1–4; ix. 16.

ment, in its most formidable aspect, in the retributions of a world of woe.

What, it is said, can be the possible utility of such an abode of unmitigated misery as hell? If punishment be not for vengeance, but for the prevention of crime, why not slay the wicked with a sentence of utter annihilation, and cast them out, not from heaven only, but out of being, amid the rubbish of chaos?

My Brethren, singular as it may seem to some among you who have not studied the nature of mind, a moment's careful consideration to one who *has* studied the nature of mind, will satisfy him that moral beings cannot be governed by physical coercion, but must be governed by moral inducements. The power of God himself over the will is exerted through motives presented to that will, and not by direct efficiency; for a free will even God himself cannot control by a violation of its freedom. Hence, Milton, if a poet, spake like a philosopher when he represented Satan "in adamantine chains and penal fire," as nevertheless boasting of his unconquerable will, and courage never to submit or yield.[f]

Now, the obedient angels, like all other intelligent creatures, are moral beings, and governed, of course, by moral inducements; or their virtue would be no more praiseworthy, than the harmonious combination and marvellous achievements of wood, and brass, and iron, in some singular machine. One of those inducements, constituting unquestionably a vital and energetic motive, is a manifest, and a visible, a perpe-

[f] Paradise Lost, i. 48, 106.

tual, and a realized manifestation, of the consequences of disobedience, in the miseries of their fallen associates. And that manifestation is made before them in the world which we inhabit. We mistake prodigiously, if we suppose this world was made for ourselves alone; and has not spiritual, as well as physical connexions, with the worlds around it. It is a moral theatre, not for itself simply. It is so in the grandest exhibition of its whole amazing history, the work of redemption. For what were "all things" *here* created, according to the philosophy of a Saint Paul, how little soever thought of by unsaintly politicians and votaries of human science? "To the intent," he answers, "that now, unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known *by the Church* the manifold wisdom of God."[g] And if, in this way, the world we live in was designed to be an exhibition, and a study, and a memento, for the inhabitants of other worlds, then, why not for the demonstrations of justice as well as mercy? It is destined to be the scene of the devil's most crushing defeat, as well as his repeated victories. "For this purpose," says a text which perplexes many, because it points to an unseen consummation, "For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."[h] This world, very possibly, in a period of its history of which we have no record, was all his own; for he is called, over and over again by an evangelist, the Prince of this world; and in his interview with Christ, he claimed what Christ did not re-

g Eph. iii. 10. *h* 1 John, iii. 8.

buke him for, its absolute and entire fee-simple. But, alas! the crown of empires crumbled from his brow. He fell; and the world, new-born, was given to a new race, upon which, as supplanters of himself, he has ever looked with implacable envy, hatred, and detestation. And this world even now, no doubt, is a purgatory to himself and his fellow-apostates; where they are unceasingly seeking rest, but finding none. To us they are invisible, except in the forms of deceit and witchcraft; making frequent show of "great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect," and make them partners in their fate, the proselytes of hell. But to spirits like themselves, and who sinned not with them, they are spectacles of unmingled degradation and wretchedness. To such beings, this perhaps doubly-fallen world is no congenial home; but we are assured they visit, at God's bidding, (not at ours,) these earthly shores, familiar to them in ages past, to be ministering spirits to us on the spot, and amid the warfare in which they came off conquerors.

Because their former associates are put down merely, and not slain, are permitted to live, but doomed to suffer, they, when they come hither and behold their ruin, are all the better fortified against those impulses to disobedience which once pervaded their loyal ranks, and threw unnumbered sons of the morning into an endless eclipse of shame and woe. They see what we could see, if our eyes were opened, devils entering into swine, or into men with swinish appetites, and trying for a while to conceal their own misery beneath the

debasement or the destruction of their victims. They start with holy horror from the ghastly apparition, and fly back to their abodes of bliss, happier than ever in their true allegiance, readier than ever to fly to creation's utmost verge, to do God's slightest bidding, rather than harbor one rebellious thought, and to be exiles from his presence and the glory of his power.

Wherefore, my Brethren, this sorry world may be no unimpressive or unuseful lesson to the still obedient angels. And if so, a still sorrier one may not be without its uses for ourselves, should we ever become like them in exaltation and proximity to God, and be sent forth, as they are, to them who are struggling for salvation. And respecting such a possibility, Scripture is not altogether so silent as may be fancied. In his wondrous descriptions of unseen realities, and of marvels imagination could not compass, St. John speaks not impertinently for the object I have in view. He thus portrays the sufferings of some of God's worst enemies as a spectacle to heaven itself. "The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture, into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone, in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever."[i]

Who can tell, but that such a spectacle, and its immortal flames, may be a necessity as indispensable as it is terrific, that God's people may be everlastingly unforgetful of the issues of rebellion against supreme

[i] Rev. xiv. 10, 11.

authority, boundless wisdom, perfect love? If the prince of this great globe—one who possessed intelligence and virtue sufficient to preside over its noblest destinies, and who still has sagacity enough to carry sorrow to all its corners—if *he* could fall, why may not other and inferior angels fall, as well? If Adam, in the state of his perfection, in the former Paradise, could fall, why may not his children copy his example, in Paradise regained? I see no strict or unnatural impossibility in such things, if we are always and invariably to be moral beings, governed by moral suasion, and not by physical constraints. The impossibility must arise from God's presentation to us of motives, overwhelmingly invincible. To a moral being of unsoiled purity, and unworn sensitiveness, a spectacle of consummate ruin may be such a motive. The penalty of death, if conceived in *all* its fulness, might have deterred Eve and Adam from their awful venture. So the *whole* significance of such a penalty may be the moral constraint, one day to be exhibited, and made indelible. And if so, the immortality of hell may be *one* grand demonstration, which God brings in review before his obedient subjects, to confirm them in their allegiance—their unfailing allegiance—to his sovereign throne.

Hell, my Brethren, may be a spectacle not for us alone, but for the whole illimitable universe of God. It may be the grand centre of evil, the great gulf of mischief and wretchedness, towards which the inhabitants of a hundred worlds, or a million, may be directed, as the consummation of sin, in its deepest, pro-

foundest degradation and misery. Countless myriads, therefore—nay, the universe itself—may be the safer for its apalling, yet resistless, demonstrations. As the kings of the earth shall one day stand afar off from mystic Babylon, lest they partake her destiny, so may the ransomed hereafter stand aloof from the abyss where all the sin, and all the woe, of a universe shall be entombed, and rise to a higher strain than ever, in praise of that mighty Power which can purge the widest empire of every traitor to its peace. And then will be the time to imitate the proclamation of the angel, "Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters."[j]

[j] Rev. xiv. 7.

SERMON VI.

THE RAINBOW.

"*And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you for perpetual generations: I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud: and I will remember my covenant which is between me and you, and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth.*"—Genesis, ix. 12–17.

THE first idea which seemed to present itself to the patriarch Noah, as he stepped forth from the ark, the survivor of a world, was, that the Being who had punished man so awfully must be propitiated as soon as possible. Accordingly, his first act was to build an altar, and offer a rich sacrifice. The feeling and the act were perfectly natural. For who can describe the awe and embarrassment of his feelings, who was entering a world over which death had long reigned

supreme? Not a living creature remained of all that once had existed: the very creeping things had all gone. Amid the dreadfully barren solitude, the patriarch felt the nearness of death intensely, and hastened, with blood and incense and prayer, to appease the wrath which might be hovering around him still.

The Almighty appreciates the trouble and terror of his mind. He not only accepts his humble endeavors to propitiate him, but he solemnly assures him that he does so. He encourages him to believe, that though he is walking over a world of graves, he may do so with security. 'Never again,' he declares, 'shall the human race be swept away, and the toils of generations come to nought. While the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease.'

And such an explicit assurance, we might have thought quite enough; for what is truer or greater than God's own word? Nothing, it may be replied, most justly. And yet, with that word before characters of such sincere faith as Moses, God's law-giver—Gideon, the captain of his host—and Mary, the mother of "God manifest in the flesh"[a]—doubts have been felt, and confirmations for faith asked for. Now, Noah surpassed all these virtuous personages, in that he asked for no such confirmation. And yet, it need not be doubted, that as he looked upon the ruins of 1600 years, (for so old was the world when the deluge came,) his eye filled with tears of apprehension, and

a Abraham, too.—Gen. 15. 8.

rottenness entered into his bones. The world had thousands upon thousands in it, beyond all question, when the waters of the deluge overwhelmed it. Our Saviour himself says, that it was full of luxury and merriments; and these things are found where multitudes are gathered, where wealth has supplied the means and art the skill, to make all around man as tasteful and gratifying as possible. "In the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark."[b]

So Noah, as he surveyed the devastations of the deluge, must have seen such outspread waste and ruin, as no eye may again behold, till "the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat."[c] And doing so, he must have been made of "sterner stuff" than mortals usually are, to have looked with a dry eye, or an unfaltering heart; though the voice of mercy was meanwhile pouring promises of hope into his ear. This, he who pities like a father them who fear him, saw; and he added to his promises a sign, to make those promises sure "while the earth remaineth." He pointed to the heavens, now gilded by the rays of the sinking sun, (for the day probably was taken up in emptying the ark, and Noah employed the first leisure of evening to offer his sacrifices,) he pointed, I say, to the heavens, gilded by the setting sun, and yet dark with the clouds of a whole year of tempests, and at the mo-

b Matt. 24. 38. *c* 2 Peter, 3. 12.

ment there came forth that arch of beauty and glory, which no eye was ever tired to see.[d]

All this seems to me, my Brethren, as appropriate and natural, as any tale of forbearance and mercy could in any wise be. It seems self-evident and self-commendatory; worthy of the occasion—worthy of God—worthy of record by the Holy Ghost—worthy of our faith and veneration. And yet, in an attempt to teach you its practical lessons, I am arrested as often, at the very outset, by the doubts and carpings of the Infidel, 'How can these things be? The rainbow is but the natural effect of a natural cause—it must have been a familiar thing in the course of fifteen centuries—and how could the Almighty say, after such a lapse of time, "I do set my bow in the cloud?" How could the patriarch receive a thing *not new*, as a token that another deluge should never come?'

Before, therefore, I proceed to the direct use of my subject, it is incumbent on me to remove any obstructions, which may prevent its free access to your minds.

There are three answers which may be given to this cavil.

i.—That the rainbow was never seen before.

ii.—That, if seen, it had never been appropriated as a Divine token.

iii.—That, if seen, it had been an object of superstitious terror or wonder, rather than of religious hope and joy.

Let us consider these answers in their order.

d The text repeated.

i.—That the rainbow was, actually, never seen before.

This is by no means impossible. There are portions of the globe, now, where it seldom or never rains; and of course the bow is never visible there. And even where it does rain often, as we well know, it is comparatively a rare spectacle. It can never exist, but where the sun is *in* or *near* the horizon, and when it shines upon falling rain; for I presume you understand the bow is occasioned by the passage of the light *through* the drops, and not by its *reflection from* them, as was supposed in ancient times. The rays of light are *refracted*, as philosophers say, i. e., bent in passing through the drops; and being bent, some more, some less, are separated from each other, and appear in the various colors of which each ray is made up, no less than seven colors making up one ray, viz.: the violet, the indigo, the blue, the green, the yellow, the orange, and the red. Of course here are circumstances, necessary to form a rainbow, which must perpetually render it an object somewhat rare; and so we find it. It is always so remarkable to see a perfect and a bright one, that a person of the slightest taste for beauty, is glad to be called to view one of such a character.

Such being the philosophical nature of the rainbow, it would have required no exertion of miraculous power, on the part of God, to have prevented the sight of a rainbow till he called Noah to behold one. And the allusions made to the history of the world's climates, before the deluge, encourage the idea, that

storms were by no means so common then, as since. Thus we find, for example, that there was no rain in the garden of Eden; "but there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground."[e] If this state of things continued long, (as it continues now in some parts of the globe,) no rainbow could have made its appearance; for such mists or dews gathered during the night.

It is by no means impossible, then, or improbable, on the principles of natural philosophy, that the rainbow should never have been seen till the days of Noah.

ii.—The second answer was, that, even if seen, it had never before been appropriated as a Divine token.

It is no argument against Baptism or the Eucharist, that their outward and visible signs (water, bread, and wine) had existed, and were familiar things, long before those sacraments were instituted.[f] So it would be no argument against the employment of the rainbow, as the outward and visible sign of God's covenant not again to overwhelm the world. The symbols of the sacraments are fitting symbols, as we all can see for ourselves; and no one objects, therefore, to their Divine consecration to sacred purposes. The rainbow, as it indicates the departure of a storm, is a fitting symbol to seal the covenant, that storms, which would drown the world, had departed forever; and why then should its symbolical character be objected to, whether it were a novelty, or not, to Noah?

e Gen. 2. 5. *f* Adams on 2 Peter, 651, a.

iii.—The third answer was, that if seen *before* the deluge, the rainbow had been an object of superstitious terror or wonder, rather than of religious hope and joy.

We look upon it with delight; but forget how dependent we are for our impressions, upon the character which revelation has affixed to it. Now, it is a notorious fact, that almost all the striking appearances in the heavens occasion alarm. I myself have known the ignorant convert the Northern Lights into an omen of the Day of Judgment. And it is a fact, that the Romans considered the rainbow a pathway from the heavens, up and down which that fatal messenger travelled, who came to release a departing soul.

It is quite natural, then, to suppose, that if seen before the deluge, it had been regarded with dread. And if it had, and the Almighty, for the first time, taught man, through Noah, no more to look upon it with apprehension, then his selection of it as a token of a merciful covenant, only proves his condescension and grace to be all the greater. Instead of cavilling at his word, for the religious character which it ascribes to it, far more becoming would it be, to bow with wonder and adoration, saying, "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are thy ways than our ways, and thy thoughts than our thoughts."[g]

The infidel objection to the religious history of the rainbow has had as much, or more, notice than it deserves, Brethren: let us now turn to reflections more directly practical.

g Isaiah, lv. 9.

I.—And first, let us notice the propriety and beauty of that token, which is an emblem of man's deliverance from a deluge "while the earth remaineth."

It is a *perpetual* token. It is not like Absalom's pillar, or the sculptured marbles, to which the vanity or ambition of man has resorted to perpetuate his memory. The pyramids themselves must crumble down beneath the decay of centuries. Their history is even now buried forever in the rubbish of the past. And so will it be with all man's symbols, to create an earthly immortality. Not thus is it with God's symbols. They are as lasting as the world's elements. His bow will span the heavens, to proclaim his mercy, as long as the heavens themselves shall cover us. Time, too, will never sully its splendor. We may still say to one another, what the author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus said centuries upon centuries ago,

> "Look upon the rainbow, and praise him who made it!
> Very beautiful it is in the brightness thereof.
> It compasseth the heaven about with a glorious circle,
> And the hands of the Most High have bended it."*h*

Again it is an *apposite* token. There was something awfully apposite, in God's writing on the palace walls of Belshazzar—those walls which had witnessed to his highest earthly glee and glory—the prediction of his utter downfall. There was something pathetically apposite, in his writing upon the retiring clouds, which had rained destruction on the world, the signature of that covenant, which was to pledge the world

h Ecclus. xliii. 11, 12.

freedom from such destruction to its latest day. It was making those tremendous elements, which had combined to send whole generations to their graves, speak the language of hope to all generations, which should hereafter walk the earth, that they would never again be ministers of universal death. They formed, so to speak, the tablet; and the hand of the Almighty wrote upon them, with a pen of glory, his signature to the covenant of the world's salvation. Who could have wished, or dreamed of, a place so fitting? Who, as he reads it there, does not feel as if the pledge of "reasonable religious and holy hope," were inscribed where the eye would most love to see it? As the glory which shone around the tomb of Jesus, at the moment of his resurrection, showed his power over the darkness of death, so does the emblem of his mercy, which God sometimes hangs out upon the clouds, show his power over the waters of the firmament. Jesus illuminates the gloomy sepulchre: God brightens the gloomy sky: hope springs afresh in man's foreboding heart.

Again it is a *conspicuous* token. It is not like the glories forbidden to the multitude, which Moses saw upon the Mount, or those of which we have but a description, however vivid, such as Daniel or St. John have painted, as well as the written page could paint them. It is for all, and for all to see, with their own eyes. And it is as easily seen, by hundreds and by thousands, as by one. We consider it a grand achievement, to exhibit the emblem of oath-taking, in a monarch or a president, to as great a multitude as possible.

But as many millions as could see within one horizon —nay, perhaps every living mortal on the face of the earth, if gathered within such an horizon—might look on, when the Almighty hangs out the emblem of that oath, which gives the world fresh life.[i] There, in his own broad heavens, he might unfurl it; and an assembly such as worships him above, ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands might look on and say, 'Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto the mercy of which it is the token!' There is something divinely sublime in an emblem which might be honored by a host like this.

But I may dwell too long on such reflections as these; and with an allusion to the other topic named, viz.: the beauty of the rainbow, I will pass on to another division of the subject.

And, in relation to its beauty, I am of course to speak of it, not as a poet or a painter, but as a preacher.

It may do for Milton to speak of it, as

> "those colored streaks in Heaven,
> Distended as the brow of God appeased;"

or for Guido to represent the Virgin and the Infant Saviour, with his highest art, by enthroning them on its glorious arch. It is for the Minister of God to tell you, that the rainbow is a reflection of more than earthly beauty. It is an element of the beauties of heaven itself; it glows in that firmament where the sunshine is not needed, but the Lord God and the

[i] God regarded the act as an oath.—Isaiah, liv: 9.

Lamb beam forth everlasting glory. "As the appearance of the bow," says the prophet Ezekiel, disclosing to us a glimpse of the world above—"As the appearance of the bow, that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it," adds he, "I fell upon my face."[j]

When a door in heaven, as he expresses it, was opened for St. John, to go up and look in upon its glories, he says that "behold a throne was set in heaven, and One sat on the throne! And He that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine-stone, and there was a rainbow round about the throne in sight like unto an emerald."[k] And so he afterwards describes the mighty angel, whose face was like the sun, and his feet like pillars of fire, as clothed with a cloud, and a rainbow upon his head;[l] a picture which, perhaps, taught Milton his sublime idea of calling the rainbow "the brow of God;" for to the Bible are the greatest poets and orators indebted for their grandest imagery.[m]

Now, the use which I would make of the idea that, in its beauty, the rainbow is a derivation from, and a reflection of, the beauties of the upper heaven, is this. Let it convince you that, as we never tire of gazing upon what is a mere similitude of celestial glory, still less shall we tire of gazing upon the unsurpassed, unsurpassable originals. Men sometimes wonder that

j Ezek. i. 28. *k* Rev. iv. 2–3. *l* Rev. x. i.
m Tucker's Light of Nat. ch. xxix., § 20; or vol. ii., 407-8.

we can describe one of the employments of heaven as an enraptured contemplation of God's majesty, and as saying, day and night, unwearied, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory!"[n] But they are never wearied, they say, with the beauties of Nature, or the wonders of Science. And yet, whose are these beauties? whose these wonders, but God's?—and after all, perhaps, God's "childish things;"[o] such as he thinks fitted to this infancy of our eternal existence. These "childish things" can occupy all our time, and fill our faculties to the full; and then we can stare with learned curiosity, and ask how God himself could give us sleepless employment, night and day. Ah! Brethren, so the world, by self-conceited wisdom, often knows not God.

But I shall consume too much time; let me hurry, then, to the last topic.

II. Of what is the rainbow designed to remind us?

Directly of one, and indirectly of another very important fact. Directly, that the seasons, with all their attendant blessings, are the covenanted gifts of God. Indirectly, that momentous truths can be embodied and set forth in emblems.

1.—That the seasons, with all their attendant blessings, are the covenanted gifts of God.

There was a year, in our poor world's history, when "seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night,"[p] *did* cease, in a

n Isa. vi. 3.

o Chateaubriand's Beauties, i. 243.

p The Deluge lasted three hundred and seventy-seven days.

manner supremely awful. It was a year whose changeless horrors could have been second only to those of chaos; "when the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." And what secures this same abode of guilty mortals from its return? Nothing, nothing but the covenant of God's mercy. But for that covenant, every storm would seem the harbinger of utter ruin, and man, in despair, might rush into deeper wickedness, like those Jews who, in the madness of misfortune, exclaimed, "There is no hope; but we will every one walk after his own devices, and we will every one do the imagination of his evil heart."[q] Even now, there are few things gloomier or more saddening than a protracted storm—the heavens lowering and pouring day after day, for a single week, make man feel chilly and damp to his very bones, and his heart begins to fail. How soon Paul's fellow voyagers gave over, and were ready to sink in apathy into a watery grave! "And when neither sun nor stars, in many days, appeared, and no small tempest lay on us; all hope that we should be saved was then taken away."[r]

Such was the natural feeling of mariners, in an almost shipwrecked vessel. And how much better might ours be, did we suppose we were living in an almost shipwrecked world. True, we might laugh at calamity, as thousands did, "when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah;"[s] but it is harder to laugh at prophecy fulfilled, than at pro-

q Jer. xviii. 12. r Acts, xxvii. 20. s 1 Pet. iii. 20.

phecy merely preached. The awe of the deluge would have left its indelible traces upon the stony heart of man, as it has upon the solid globe; and every clap of thunder would have sounded as the bursting of those awful floodgates, when the fountains of the great deep were broken up. But that portentous voice in the heavens, we now know, is not that of deep calling unto deep, to drown the world; and when the bow is set in the cloud, we also know, that a remembering God is looking on, with whom a thousand years are as one day, and repeating, as to the patriarch of old, his sacred promise, "seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease." And well for us will it be, if we can recall the connection of these things with God's promise, so as to associate all their blessings more nearly with that promise, and refer our enjoyment of every one of them to God's mercy and to that alone. The Church does her part to make us do so; for she teaches us to pray, at all seasons, as in the Litany, that God would give, and preserve to our use, the kindly fruits of the earth, so that in due time we may enjoy them. It is not Nature that gives us these things, Brethren, but it is the God of nature; for nature, as we often speak of it, is a mere fiction, and an atheistical fiction of the brain. *God* sends you every season's mercies. He remembers his covenant, and he writes his remembrance of it brightly on the clouds of heaven, as he pledged himself to do 4,000 years ago. Is the remembrance of it unwritten upon your heart? Do you see his bow in the sky, and not call upon your soul, and

all within you, to bless his holy name? Wonder not, if all tokens of hope in heaven be one day denied to that same atheist soul of yours, and the blackness of darkness forever be its destiny.

2.—Finally, I said that the indirect lesson taught us by the rainbow is, that momentous truths can be embodied and set forth in emblems.

Sacraments are not objected to for their moral significance, but their outward and visible signs. What virtue can there be, is the worldly, utilitarian question; what virtue can there be in signs? The thing signified is all we want.

What virtue, then, in such a sign as God's rainbow, and why can we not have the blessing of his covenant with Noah, as well without it as with it? And so we might. Though God, in language condescending to our infirmities, says he will look upon it, *and* remember his covenant, (for the expression in our version, *that* he might remember it, is too low, and the Hebrew does not require it)—although he says he will look upon it, *and* remember his covenant, yet we well know he could and would have remembered it, without it, and as easily and surely, without it, as with it. Why, then, the sign?

O, Brethren! the sign is not for God, it is for us. We need signs, for we are creatures of sense—not pure spirit as he is; and something to help us, through the senses, is a real assistance, a genuine blessing. And this is the whole philosophy of sacraments, and of all external religion. God wants no such things, but *we* do; and he gives them to us, not as penances, but as

privileges. We, in the exercise of that proud, self-conceited wisdom, to which I have already alluded, presume to think ourselves like God, and venture to imagine that we want outward and visible signs no more than the Great Spirit. We mistake, most lamentably; we prove ourselves ignorant of "the first principles of the oracles of God;" and by those oracles such perverse minds as ours never can be born again.

Brethren, faith sees a meaning and a glory in symbols, which fills her with joy unspeakable. She finds her way, through them, up to the Father of Lights; though unbelief stumbles over them into deeper and darker errors. Noah looked upon the sacramental emblem of God's covenant; and, I doubt not, his faith was brighter and steadier. Many a Christian has looked upon the sacramental emblems of God's covenant in the Gospel; and his faith, like Noah's, has been refreshed and strengthened. Others have trusted to their own hearts, and God has written them fools,[t] and thus has he rebuked them: "Behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks; walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled. This shall ye have of mine hand, ye shall lie down in sorrow."[u]

And now let us say, with heaven's blessed host: "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of Saints."[v]

t Prov. xxviii. 26. *u* Isa. l. 11. *v* Rev. xv. 3.

SERMON VII.

SUBMISSION OF THE WILL, A PREREQUISITE FOR KNOWLEDGE.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

"*If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.*"—John, vii. 17.

When a religious teacher asks our faith for doctrines which are not self-evident, and not self-commending, men frequently desire some experimental proof, by which they may put such doctrines to the test. Now, such a posture of affairs, and such a desire, are any thing but novelties in human history. We see them illustrated by the Jews, when our Saviour came before them, with a system quite novel and unacceptable. Immediately they assailed him as an innovator, and an innovator whose ignorance, or rather, whose utter want of scholastic tuition, was sufficient to rule out his most sacred theories, as mere enthusiastic whims. "How," exclaimed they, "knoweth this man letters, having never learned."[a]

a Is. vii. 15.

It behoved him, perhaps, at this crisis, to offer them some criterion by which they might decide, whether his doctrines were as credible as they were assuming. He calmly set aside their feeble sneer at his imagined ignorance, by avowing that his doctrine was not his own, as the mere human excogitator which they esteemed him. "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." And then he proceeded to enlarge, in answer to their secret thoughts, as he often did; evincing his perfect knowledge of the human heart. "If now," we may imagine him saying—"if now you desire a practical test, which is within your own reach, and by which you may judge of the virtues of my declarations, I will present you one perfectly feasible, and readily accessible. If any man will do the will (or, as it might be rendered, is willing to do the will) of him that sent me, he shall know of the doctrine commended to him, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself."

He did not appeal to miracles, as he might have have done, and as, in fact, he did do, on other occasions. He was dealing with the more cultivated, speculative and philosophical portion of the Jewish people; as I infer from what immediately preceded, and from their objection to himself, as deficient in letters or scholastic education. He would show such persons that there is something which they may lay hold of, to promote and fasten their convictions, beside evidence offered to the senses, and which strikes the uncultivated, perhaps, more forcibly than those who look at the essences more than at the appearances of things,

and at metaphysical reasons more than at outward demonstrations. To such persons he seems to say: It is in your power to put my doctrines to rational and experimental proof, if you desire something besides external testimony, by which to verify their Divinity and Divine efficiency.

And that test is, the submission of your will, beforehand, and a reception, upon trial, of those doctrines in their assumed character, as able to satisfy your understandings and to sanctify your hearts. Admit them for what they claim to be worth, and try them thoroughly; and if, after fair trial, they prove illusory and unsubstantial, then throw them away as rubbish. This antecedent submission of the will, this consent to take these doctrines upon trial, will secure, ultimately, what you further want, to render you complete and staid believers; a submission of the understanding and of the affections also. Be assiduous and patient, and the latter submission will succeed the former, in due order and in due time. Your preference for a commencement would, no doubt, be, to have every thing square, beforehand, with *your* understanding and *your* affections, and then to leave the submission of the will to follow afterwards. This is not God's economy, nor is it truly Divine philosophy. Let your wills bend, first, to him whose will is sovereign and inerrable, and he will recompense you afterwards for the surrender. But unless this surrender is yielded at the outset, no future step can be taken with certain safety, and none, of course, with solid satisfaction.

Our Saviour (as I trust you will perceive, my

Brethren,) is more complaisant to such a predicament, as the text presupposes, than the Church of Rome, which assumes, if possible, a more than Divine supremacy, and demands your unconditional surrender—in will, in understanding, and in affections—in your entire frame and feelings as rational and self-governing creatures, and will not allow one to hold any opinion of importance, or utter any word of weight, but as she puts them into his mind, and applies them, like the Eucharistic wafer, to his lips, by sacerdotal guidance. This is her anti-Catholic austerity. Christ, with a generosity truly Catholic, asks the previous submission of your wills alone, with the assurance that such submission shall not be costly, though in appearance arbitrary, for thereby you shall know of his doctrine, whether or not it be of God.

Of course, such submission implies your acquaintance with, and your studious examination of, the Scriptures. This the Church of Rome practically discourages, whatever may be her theory respecting the Scripture's value; and, accordingly, we find, that in a practical point of view, the Bible, in her communion, may as well be laid upon the shelf. It is there an unnecessary book; and her priests can get along as well, nay, better without it. It is a hindrance, and not a help, to them.

It is my juster and happier commission to ask you to open that blessed book, and put its doctrines to the test which our Saviour himself proposes. All *I* would ask, is all which he asks; and all I would ask of the most intelligent and inquisitive, is all which he

asked of such a class among the Jews—that they submit their wills to the will of the Almighty, or, at the very least, (and this modification the text itself sanctions,) be anxious, solicitous, and resolved to do so, when the happy result of a concord between themselves and him will consecutively follow. This primary submission will secure the resultant submission of their understanding and affections; and they will ultimately be enabled to say with an apostle, "Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ."

And now, my Brethren, having opened and explained our subject, let me ask your attention to some arguments which vindicate the propriety of the stand taken by our Saviour, and which may possibly convince you, that this is the most appropriate and auspicious beginning which any enquirer after truth may make, when exhorted to believe.

I. Then, let us consider the propriety of the requisition, which asks the submission of our wills to God, when we seek an assurance for the verity of God's doctrines.

We, most unhappily, most singularly, and I cannot but say most perversely, when we approach God's Revelation to learn how we may exercise faith in its apparent contents, come with the implied, if not avowed supposition, that God and ourselves are equals. We expect him to condescend, and never entertain one idea of meeting his condescension with cordial homage. We put ourselves into the seat of

an arbitrator, and regard him as approaching in the character of an advocate, to reason and persuade.

This is reversing the order of nature and decorum as thoroughly as possible—is turning it absolutely upside down. God's Word cannot (in the very nature of things, cannot) accost us as if upon an equality with its own transcendant elevation. Though spoken by men, it is the language not of an equal, but of a superior—of an infinite and inapproachable superior. It is the language, too, not of unreason, (as some, in a sort of infatuation dream,) but of a reason which comprehends *all* that is rational, from its beginning to its end; and which, therefore, is reasonable in the only true sense in which any thing can be reasonable, essentially, and permanently, and unmistakably. That which seems reasonable to us, amid the circumscribed boundaries of time, of limited research and of mortal conjecture, and which seems to be very reasonable too, may all be exploded as irrationality and folly by a few generations in advance. Human philosophers are as changeable as human history; and it is idle for us to talk of a standard of rationality which our own minds, or the impressions of any school or class of mankind, shall at any period establish.

What God pleases to say, however, comes from the highest, the most reliable, and the most unchangeable of all sources; and *that*, therefore, (how diverse soever from our present acceptation of things,) must be infallible and immortal truth. This ought to be an axiom with us; and, of course, our first enquiry should be, not, why has God said one thing, and left another un-

said? not, how can he exhibit a thing *thus*, rather than disclose it *so?* But our simpler and shorter enquiry should ever be, *what* has he said? That, and that by itself, and of itself, should be enough, and completely enough, for creatures such as we.

And it would be, my Brethren, if we would but realize what we undertake, when we bring a divine declaration before the tribunal of human reason, and attempt to mete out the infinite, by the measures of the finite. For this is not desperately irreligious only, it is outrageously unphilosophical; and one of the greatest fathers of the Church discovered as much, to his wholesome mortification, when he was laboring to do piously what we so often do presumptuously, viz., make our understandings a measure for the declarations of a mind which discerns the end from the beginning, more easily than we the beginning from the end; the effect from the cause, more accurately than we the cause from the effect—which knows, in a word, the essences, the elements, and the remotest influence of any thing and all things.

[b] "We are told of St. Augustine, that on one occasion, when his mind was much engaged in the contemplation of the doctrine of the Trinity, he was walking by the sea, and saw a child filling a shell with the water, which it then carried and poured into a hollow in the sand. 'What are you doing, my boy, with that water?' said the saint. 'I am,' replied the boy, 'going to put all the sea into this hole.' The fa-

[b] Jukes on the Gospels, p. 9.

ther smiled and passed on; when a voice seemed to say to him, 'and thou, too, art doing the like, in thinking to comprehend the depths of God, in the narrow limits of thy finite mind.'"

Probably, this greatest and most renowned of ancient theologians never forgot this salutary lesson; and it disposed him to treat the doctrines of religion, ever after, with the submission of a lowly disciple, rather than with a temper befitting his days of scepticism and heresy—the disdainful pride of a philosopher. And, my Brethren, if we would learn as effectual a lesson from the child upon the sea-shore, as did the profoundly astute, but the also profoundly pious Augustine, the issue might be as happy in our case, as in his. But the deplorable fact too often is, that we strive, with childish self-confidence, to put the boundless infinite into the little hollow, where our ounces of brain lie folded up. We make gods of ourselves, and umpires of our wills, when we ought most reverently to remember that it is Jehovah who is in heaven, and not we; and that he is the Dictator and Revealer, while we are but to listen and to learn.

But God alleges what I cannot comprehend, says my unfortunate fellow-sinner, who fancies that God's words must be attenuated to the dimensions of his mind, rather than his restive will bowed into the subjection of devout humility. No doubt he does; and so do you tell your little children a hundred things they cannot comprehend, but must take your word for—things which stagger and perplex them, just as the Bible often staggers and perplexes you. Yet, you

give their incredulity no quarter; you will not endure a moment's parley. Take a father's word for it, and wait till you are wiser, is your imperious ultimatum.

And may not your Father in the heavens exact as much of you? Remember, and consider, God is incredibly, immeasurably, more your paternal superior than you are such to a lisping infant. And if *your* claim to submission is irrepealable, and irresistible, what shall be said of *his*? Oh, let not your will rise in rebellion against a source so overawing. I say your *will*—for the secret, the core of the difficulty, after all, lies there, more than in that reason, which you are apparently so solicitous to satisfy. Once make up your determination to bend your will to that of Heaven;—once be ready, or desirous, without regard of consequences, to do what Heaven requires, and the obstacles in your path will melt away and disappear. Our Saviour did not preach mental illumination, but mental subjugation, to the Jews, when he proposed to them to put his doctrine to the searching test of practical experiment. And this is the grand embarrassment to multitudes of enquirers now. They are not ready to say, beforehand, 'I will take God at His word. He is the Instructer, and I am but the pupil. He is the Judge, and I am but the recipient of His supreme award. He is to dictate, and I am to obey.'

Once let us realize these relative positions—once let us exert the temper of mind which those positions strongly enjoin, that we be fain to accept God's wishes from His own lips, and not from the whispers of our

own conjectures; and the chief impediment, the stone of stumbling and rock of offence to our progress in divine knowledge, crumbles into fragments, and the road before us is straight and obvious. The mountains of doubt and hesitation, which before clogged our passage, are cast into the sea, and we verify the paradox of the prophet, "the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain."[c] "When I became a Christian," says Chateaubriand, "I did not yield, I allow, to great supernatural illuminations; but my conviction of the truth of Christianity sprung from the heart. I wept, and I believed."[d]

Yes, my Brethren, let the will become flexible, and the heart a little tender; let the sigh of regret be heaved, and the tear of penitence begin to flow, for the grievous mistake you have all along made, that you are to manufacture a religion for yourselves, and not take it ready-made at the hands of Heaven; and if he has half done, who has well begun, then one-half of the work of your salvation is accomplished. The rest will be comparatively free from labor. They who have started aright in the journey to a better world will follow on to know the Lord. Light will break in upon them, fresher and clearer from every hill-top, in their ascent to Paradise, till, in the cheering climax of the promise, "they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk onward, and shall not faint."[e]

c Isaiah, xl. 4. *d* Beauty of Christianity, i. pp. 16, 17.
e Isaiah, xl. 31.—Lowth.

II. I have laid the stress of argument, my Brethren, where it should be, upon the difficulty which lies in the very opening of that process, by which we may learn how to prove, to our own satisfaction, the truth of doctrines claiming a divine origin; and there may be, and will be, less necessity, perhaps, for dwelling so long on others which contribute to the same end. Yet, such others may not be passed by; and so I proceed to show, further, why the submission of the will is a prerequisite to obtain that satisfaction, respecting the truth of Christian doctrines, which so many enquire after, and seem to long for. And a second argument which I would urge is, that Christian doctrines were not given as a discipline for our intellects, but as a remedy for corrupted hearts.

If those doctrines had been published as the tenets of philosophical academies, to sharpen our powers of reasoning, to teach us critical acumen and dialectic skill, to provoke us to scholastic attainments, and equip us for learned disputations, then we might well argue about them, as we full often do. Then we might consistently treat them, as theologians themselves have sometimes inconsistently treated them, in the chairs of professional science, as if they were mere affairs of metaphysics, to be debated of, and wrangled with, as were law questions in the halls of Gamaliel, or philosophical questions in the halls of the Epicureans and Stoics, who encountered St. Paul at Athens.

Legal questions were disputed under Gamaliel's eye, with such astuteness, and by St. Paul himself, among other pupils of that famous doctor, that no doubt

many who experienced his tuition esteemed themselves proficients in Jewish jurisprudence, so that they could safely boast, as Paul himself did, "that they were taught it perfectly."[f] Philosophical questions were debated with so much zest and freedom in the assemblies of the Epicureans, and the Stoics, that they were as curious to hear Paul speak of Christ, as of Socrates or Plato; and of the Resurrection, as of their own grand query about the chief constituent of human happiness.

But with all his erudition about the law, and with his superadded exemplification of its precepts, as he once had understood it, it is quite evident that St. Paul comprehended not a particle of the grand spiritual purpose, for which the law had been communicated. Accordingly, he afterwards acknowledged that he was alive without the law once, but that when the commandment came, i. e., came up before him in all its latitude and bearings,[g] sin revived, and he absolutely died, i. e., died to every self-flattering hope which before he had entertained. And this arose from the fact that he had looked at the law as a scientific system, addressed merely to his intellect, and to be regarded and treated like any other scholastic subject, and not as a part in the sublime economy of Redemption, where it would be a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death. And the Epicureans and the Stoics blundered about "Jesus and the Resurrection," for a reason not dissimilar. They contemplated them but as new adventures

[f] Acts, xxii. 3. [g] Rom. vii. 9.

in philosophy, and styled the preacher a babbler, or asked impertinently the meaning of his most solemn sermon, as if Christianity were a novel speculation, and nothing more.

My Brethren, the great object, the gloriously benevolent object of Christianity, must be before you, when you reflect upon its claims; and especially upon its claim for a submission of the will, as a prerequisite for a just appreciation of its doctrines. Christianity does not come to you as a theory, but as a remedy; it comes to you, not to be disputed of, but to save you. It is a medicine for the soul, and not a play-thing for the mind. And as you may not arraign the physician of your body, and hold a parley with him about the character and quality, and composition of the ingredients which he prescribes, but must take them or die; so is it with the prescriptions of the sagest of all physicians, the physician of your sin-sick soul. You must take his medicines, and put them to the test of practical efficiency. You must be willing to abide by his directions, and look to him implicitly, and not to your own understandings for far-reaching consequences. And, then, you may not be disappointed, as you now are, when you stop to query, to compare, to conjecture, to argue, and to ponder; and the disease, meanwhile, shall get a headway that nothing can resist, and you descend with fatal rapidity to a hopeless grave.

Had St. Paul but begun with the law, in its momentous moral aim, as a schoolmaster, to bring him to Jesus Christ; had the Epicureans and Stoics conceived

of Christ, not as a schemer for earth, but a Redeemer for heaven; and of the resurrection not as a romantic hallucination, but an awful reality of bliss or woe; oh! how much sooner had the first found his Saviour, without becoming what he proclaimed himself, "the chief of sinners;" and how had the sneers and mockery of the others, been turned into those drops of penitence which made Chateaubriand a quick believer, come though he did out of a school worse than any which ever bred doubting and carping Grecians—the school of French ribaldry and atheism.

Accept the doctrines of Christianity, then, not as problems for your intellects, but as remedies for the diseases of your souls, and you will find it inexpressibly easier than you now do, to attempt that performance of God's will which can lead you, ultimately, to a triumph over every perplexity.

III. I have but one argument more, though the subject would justify multitudes. It is this. The very promise with which the text encourages our submission, cannot be fulfilled without a practical subordination of our wills to the will of Heaven, as a prerequisite.

Who can successfully teach any one that for which he has no proclivity, no previous attempering solicitude? How notorious is the remark, even in the inculcation of human sciences, that there must be some concord between them and our minds—some taste, some fitness for, some previous adaptation, or our acquirements in them are slow, arduous, or impossible. This person, we say, makes no proficiency in the

classics, for he has no fancy for languages. That person, we again say, makes no proficiency in mathematics, for he has no fancy for the science of magnitudes and numbers. We find no difficulty in unravelling such cases; and why should we find any more in unravelling a case where the soul makes no progress in religion, because it is moved by none of those anxieties or inclinations which render religion a necessity for its ease, a resting-place for its longings, a solace and a justification for its hopes.

The religion whose theme is redemption, ought surely to presuppose, on our part, some consciousness of the indispensable necessity of the redemption which it fervently commends. The religion whose theme is sanctification, ought surely to anticipate, on our part, some sensitive appreciation of the sanctification on which it earnestly insists. But, ordinarily, we have no troublesome, no weighty convictions about the peril of the sins for which religion provides an atonement; no such convictions about the corruption and degeneracy of the nature for which religion holds forth pledges of new-creating grace. And how, then, when religion *does* talk to us, though with seven-fold emphasis, can it talk about any thing but riddles or mysteries; and how natural that, appraising not its beneficent aim, and the terrible cost which attends its rejection, we turn away from its counsels, and say of them what Israel of old said concerning her liturgy, (God's ordinances, respecting which she could not penetrate the design of,) Oh, what a weariness![h]

[h] Mal. i. 13.

Yes, Brethren, this is a plain case, and a very imperious one. You expect religion to be understood by you, and to be a blessing to you; but you do not realize the preparation, not to be dispensed with, which can render it consistently intelligible, consistently a blessing. The legitimate preparation, on your part, must go before your enjoyment of its benedictions. You see this affirmed in the text as a principle, and I have striven to show you its reasonableness as a rule. Make the preparation contemplated, if you would secure the promised boon which is to follow. Be willing, be prompt to do God's will, unhesitatingly, uncomplainingly, and without reserve. God urges no exactions which are purely arbitrary. If it did seem a little arbitrary to require submission beforehand, you now have the reason in the strongest of all shapes possible, because his very desire to bless you, cannot be fulfilled on any other condition.

He cannot give you a Redeemer till you feel your need of one. He cannot give you a new heart till you appreciate the curse of a corrupt one. But be willing to be redeemed, be anxious to be redeemed, be terribly afraid lest you should not be, and the doctrine of the New Testament about a Mediator will be to you like a fountain gushing out of the sands of the desert, as the eye of the fainting, panting traveller, first catches a glimpse of its sparkling waters. So will it be with its doctrine of sanctification, when the heart which now beats unconcernedly in your bosoms, is felt to be diseased, and you long for one that clings to the world less eagerly, and is less an alien to its

God. So will it be with the doctrines of a Church and of sacraments, when you become aware that your wayward, straying nature, needs all the outward helps, as well as inward graces, which the institutions of religion can supply, to keep Divine truth fresh and vivid in our recollections, and to mix it up with our active habits as a part of life's routine. And so will it be with the whole of religion, both outward and inward, in its various departments of faith, discipline and worship. You will then realize how that, from its beginning to its end, it is but a series of remedies to deliver you from the corruptions of sin, from the victories of temptation, and the catastrophe of a godless death; and to fit you, more and more, faster and faster, for another and a better country, till made meet for the inheritance of the saints, your departure from this world shall be an exaltation and not an overthrow, a gain and not a loss.

O, come then to the Bible, with the preparation which it anticipates—that universal willingness to accept its remedies which its very character presupposes, and your knowledge of it shall be worth, to you, a thousand times over, a knowledge which might make you the envy of this world, but the pity of heaven and the victim of perdition.

SERMON VIII.

THE REPENTANCE OF THE WOMAN WHICH WAS A SINNER.

FOR SEXAGESIMA SUNDAY.

"*And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment; and stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.*"—Luke, vii. 37–38.

THE story of the sinful woman, which one of the lessons of the day commends to our attention, is a subject, Brethren, that has too many points of deep and pathetic interest to be considered, fully, in a single discourse. It is like the picture of a great master, which requires the powers of such a master for its full description. Accordingly, I shall not so much as attempt a general view of it, but, confining myself to a single train of thought, endeavor to present that, definitely and clearly. I will consider it in this single light, as an example of repentance, and the feelings with which repentance is viewed by One, who is able to forgive the saddest sins. And if I leave more and better things

unsaid, than will be presented, may He, who can even make a spark of truth kindle a flame of piety, bless *all* of his truth which I *do* utter, to your minds and hearts.

I. In the first place, then, repentance may be thorough, without being noisy.*a*

Too often, repentance is measured by the loudness or wordiness of its manifestations. The man who can tell the most clamorous tale of his inward griefs, and give the longest and most particular account of what is called his experience, is generally esteemed the most penitent man. By far too frequently, has the power of personal religion been measured by the extravagant language of a diary.

Yes, it is man's fashion, to hear his fellow-man for his much speaking; especially if that speaking be sonorous and emphatic. But God's fashions are not ours: his ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts. And we see this, in regard to professions of repentance, in the case before us. It is remarkable—most memorable—that throughout the entire scene, in which our penitent acted such a conspicuous part, she uttered not a solitary word. The scene must have lasted no inconsiderable time. It was a Pharisee who had invited our Lord to partake his hospitality; and a Pharisee had always no little preparation to make, ere he could sit down to meat. Yet, during the meal, the penitent was bathing, and wiping, and anointing our Saviour's feet; nor so

a Much may be done in religion, as in the building of Solomon's Temple, without axes and hammers.—Ch. Disc. iii. 357.

only, but he added, that she had not ceased to do so, since he came in. Notwithstanding, we cannot find so much as a single exclamation recorded as escaping her lips. Nay, it is not so much as said, that the company were disturbed by a solitary sigh, heaving up from her anguished breast. She wept profusely; but though you might almost have heard the tears, as, amid the profound stillness of the scene, they rained upon the Saviour's feet, yet her lips murmured nothing. She kissed those sacred feet, which had walked many a weary round on ministries of love, and were, by-and-by, to be torn with the irons of the cross. She wiped them with her hair, she anointed them with her precious ointment; but she did the whole with a quietness as hushed and reverent, as if embalming his body for his burial.

It is idle, then, my Brethren, to suppose that religious emotion, more than any other, to be genuine, must be talkative or noisy. We do not generally trust human emotion, on other subjects, when fullest of speech, most profuse in outward demonstrations. The case before us teaches us that we not only may, but ought to do so, in reference to religion. No one can doubt the earnestness or depth of that repentance which has been approved by our heart-searching Redeemer. But he approved such repentance when entirely and perseveringly silent. Is not such repentance, then, (so that the heart be as fully in it, as was the penitent woman's,) the rather his choice?

Before I leave this topic, let me say that it furnishes an ample vindication of what is sometimes complained

of in our service—the brevity of our general confession of sins.[b]

You see that He, who looks upon the heart, wants not many words—nay, requires not so much as *one*. If our hearts are in that confession, Brethren, it will be long enough for heaven. If they are not in it, we could not make it long enough, though we spun it out with amplifications which would occupy the live-long day.[c]

II. In the second place, our theme teaches us that true repentance is perfectly ingenuous.

Nicodemus, a master in Israel, and a man no doubt of upright deportment and outward blamelessness, came to our Saviour by night, and professed himself half his disciple. And I never wondered that our Saviour opened on him, immediately, with the indispenable necessity of baptism by water and the Holy Ghost—baptism by water, to make him visibly, and not by stealth, a member of the Church below—and baptism by the Holy Ghost, to make him really, and not seemingly, a member of the Church above—the Church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven. To one like Nicodemus, our Saviour seemed to do nothing but throw obstacles in his way, and hedge up the path to the better world, on high.

It was because the repentance of Nicodemus was not sufficiently ingenuous, that he thus, as it were, repelled him.

b Bingham's Antiq., vol. ix. 142. Bennet on the Com. Prayer, p. 25. Pierce's Vindication of Dissenters, pp. 557, 558.

c In Baxter's Reformed Liturgy, there is a direction by which "sin may be named and aggravated, when it is convenient."—pp. 64, 67.

But see how different sincere and thorough repentance is, and how different its welcome. Our penitent was a woman—her crime that which humbles woman almost beyond human pity. But she comes forth before the world, in open day, to acknowledge her transgressions. She comes into the presence of those on whose scornful lips so often hung the bitter taunt, 'Stand by, for I am holier than thou.' She expected to be denounced as a sinner, and she was so. She had, perhaps, but a trembling hope, that Jesus, who had denounced the highest in the land as hypocrites, would spare her miserable self. Yet, on such a hope, she went, and proclaimed herself the sad transgressor which the scornful mercilessly decreed her. Not a word had she to reply to their cutting denunciation. She did not say, what she might have said with perfect truth, 'He that is without sin, let him hurl the first reproach at me.' She meekly admitted the worst that they could say, by her unbroken silence.

And her perfect openness, her virtual refusal of all extenuation, her bowing, though with almost a breaking heart, to appellations sharper than a two-edged sword, obtained her the friend she wanted. Jesus poured the oil of joy into her mourning soul. He bound up her wounded spirit, and bade her depart with that peace which passeth understanding.

And here is the example for us, my Brethren. There is no use, it is most assuredly true, in attempting to hide our sins from One, before whom hell itself is naked. Yet we are too prone to act as if there were; and to encourage ourselves with the atheist

plea, 'God hath forgotten, He hideth His face, He will never see it.' A total reform in the feelings of human nature is indispensable to true repentance. We must lay our hearts bare, before Him whom we have offended. There must be no shrinking, no faltering, no evasion. We must acknowledge ourselves to be what our Church calls us—miserable offenders, without health in us, i. e., in our souls, and, by ourselves considered, sick unto death by sin. We must not halt before such an intense confession as that in the Communion Service; or from saying, as in one of the collects for Ash-Wednesday, that "we are vile earth and miserable sinners." It is entire candor, uncomplaining acquiescence, which Heaven asks, and on which only it will smile propitiously. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper"—no, not in this world, or in the world which is to come.

But only let us turn the current of our feelings and actions the other way, and all is well; "Whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall find mercy." "No sooner," says that sweet psalm for the penitent—

> "No sooner I my wound disclosed,
> The guilt that tortured me within,
> Than Thy forgiveness interposed,
> And mercy's healing balm poured in."

The woman which was a sinner could have heard this sung upon her death-bed, and wept again, as when in the house of the Pharisee who upbraided her; but her tears would have been tears of joy unspeakable, and full of glory. God grant, my Brethren, that when our hearts are fluttering, ere they stand

still forever, their last pulses may be quickened by such joy as that.

III. Our theme teaches us that true repentance is profoundly humble.

It is, by no means, improbable, considering the history of the age in which she lived, that the penitent woman was familiar with luxury and splendor. Sinners greater, beyond comparison, perhaps, than she, figured in the history of Greece and Rome, and had orators, statesmen and philosophers in their train. Wealth, and all it could command, surrounded them, and ministered to their celebrity and pride. And the general opinion respecting our penitent seems to have been, that though she filled a humbler sphere than some who have sent down dishonored names to distant times, she enjoyed all which a corrupt age and debased society allowed her.

For such an one to descend to her just level, forego every thing with which the world had gifted her, and be not poor in spirit only, but poor in every thing beside, to which she had before resorted for enjoyment, was humility indeed. But see how true and prostrating this humility, in her effort to mortify every element of former pride. The eyes, once so bright with baleful lustre, she dims and blinds with tears.[d] The lips, on whose slightest word many had

[d] Did pour down suchabundance of tears, out of those wanton eyes of hers, wherewith she had allured many unto folly, that she did with them wash his feet—wiping them with the hairs of her head, which she was wont most gloriously to set out, making of them a net of the devil.—Homilies, xxxii. part 2, or p. 511, Eng. edition.

hung enchanted, she applies to feet shod but with sandals, and, as the narrative assures us, unwashed from dust, through a host's inhospitality or forgetfulness. Those tresses, on which she had wasted hours upon hours, in decking for unhallowed merriment, now dishevelled and neglected, perform the menial office of a napkin. That ointment, which the spices of Arabia had scented, and which had weighed down in value glittering gold, she now freely applies to feet bruised or wearied with the restless labor of going about and doing good. All these circumstances, how inconsiderable soever in themselves, and in another, yet, in *her*, evince an entire abandonment of all former pride, and a prostration of the soul to the very uttermost of self-abasement.

And it is then, my Brethren, that repentance shows itself most true, in its relation to humility, when it most humbles our former selves—humbles us in relation to the sins which do most easily beset us—our favorite sins, our darling self-indulgences. Wholesale acknowledgments of our unworthiness will not answer. The rich man who has made money his idol, and grasped and ground without mercy to accumulate it, may profess to be penitent for the past; but, unless he mortifies and crucifies his covetousness, he has no repentance which will be accepted. He has not profoundly humbled that very sin which has made him guiltier before God than any he has committed. And so the poor man, whose envious soul is perpetually fretting under that prosperity which blesses his wealthier neighbor, may confess his sins also. But he, too,

will confess in vain, unless his envious discontentment has been absolutely slain, and offered up as a free-will sacrifice to God.

See to it, my Brethren, when you would avow your penitence before God, and hope for a favorable hearing; see to it, that you humble *your former selves.* It needs not an apostle to tell us that we have besetting sins. Every man knoweth the plague of his own heart, and must be aware in what quarter he is most accessible. It is for that particular plague we are to bow lowest, and make our most self-condemning confessions. And then only can we be in the right way, when we manifest such holy wisdom. It would be idle for a man, in a dropsy, to congratulate himself that he had not the consumption; or for a drunkard to rejoice that he was not a glutton. It is not the sins from which we are free, that will constitute a sort of merit and save us; but it is the sins of which we are actually guilty, which will prove our demerit, and, possibly, our ultimate ruin. It is for such sins, genuine repentance is profoundly and resolutely humble. Such repentance has a sort of holy discernment about it, and lays the axe at the root of the tree; as the self-discipline of our penitent teaches us, most pointedly and emphatically. Let us see to it, that its aptness be not forgotten.

IV. True repentance is never a solitary virtue.[e]

e Repentance is not, strictly and dogmatically speaking, Christian virtue; it is rather a preparation for it. The ploughing and triturating of soil will not, of itself, make the seed grow. Yet, without it, the planting of seed would be of little use. My language is popular, not professional.

In books and sermons, we are obliged to speak separately of the different elements of Christian character. The necessity is an obvious one, and would be a harmless one, but for the unfortunate inference which some draw, that what is spoken of separately, can exist separately. Such an inference, however, *is* drawn, if not in form, at least, in fact; and readers and hearers are accustomed to think and speak of the Christian virtues as if having a separate and independent existence. What should we say of him who, hearing an anatomist describe, abstractly, the brain or the lungs, should infer that the one could think, and the other breathe, apart from the rest of the human body? And yet, because repentance, and faith, and works, and hope, and charity, are spoken of separately and distinctly, many rashly, or thoughtlessly, adopt the habit of supposing they may *exist* as independently as they happen to be described.

Behold the corrective and the rebuke of such an error, in the case now under review. The repentance of the sinful woman is her first virtue, as that case rises before our thoughts; nay, and as a careless reader would suppose, the only virtue which is the subject of the Evangelist's notice. But if we read the story carefully, we find that love (or charity, as it is sometimes called) and faith are neither of them forgotten, before it is done. Indeed, we are informed, on the authority of our Lord himself, that love and faith existed in the bosom of our penitent, in no inferior degree. Her sins, which are many, said the Saviour, are forgiven; for

she *loved* much. And again, thy *faith* hath saved thee, go in peace.

No, my Brethren, true Christian virtues are never solitary. Here, in this tale of a penitent whom Omniscience could approve, we see the record could not be finished without distinct and ample testimony to her faith and love; and as to her works, they speak eloquently for themselves. Oh! it is a sad, a baneful, a disastrous error, which supposes true personal religion can be separated, in fact, into elements, as we separate it on paper. Disabuse yourselves, as fast and as effectually as possible, of an error so full of mischief. True Christian virtues are never solitary. On the contrary, they grow together, and in harmonious proportions. Is repentance deeper and more thorough than usual? The faith and love, which are its fruits, will be so, too; and thus we find it here. The profoundness of *her* repentance, who, sinning as she had, could so ingenuously and humbly acknowledge it, as did the penitent now before us, cannot be doubted. And what, also, is the testimony to her love and faith? Her love was much, even in view of her heart-searching Redeemer. Her faith, also, in his view, was *strong* enough to save her soul.

My Brethren, we might suspect that system of theology, which left *one* of the virtues out of its reckoning. Do you suspect your own personal piety, if any virtue of the Christian life does not appear in it? If you have not repentance, in company with faith and love, and all evincing themselves conjointly in your works, something, rely upon it, is wrong. Abandon such

piety and begin anew. You can build true piety on no foundation but that which man never laid, which is Jesus Christ. Build on that foundation, "in whom all the building" of the true Christian life, "fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord;"[f] and then you will, in due time, come, in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ—the fulness of him who filleth all in all.[g] O, blessed and holy is he who thus grows in grace! He hath part in the first resurrection: on such, the second death hath no power.[h]

V. Lastly, notice that true repentance conciliates divine sympathies.

The self-humiliation of such a penitent as our text exhibits, was a spectacle to melt the sternest. To see one, who might command the world's homage at the price of virtue, abandoning that homage utterly, and taking the lowest station before an offended God—approaching him in the person of his Son, without a word of extenuation—bathing *his* feet with torrents of tears—kissing them with deep devotion—wiping them with her hair, and anointing them with the most costly ointment—Oh! Justice herself might have turned from the scene, as hazardous to her inflexibility. Who, who could be harsh towards one, whose frailty was thus bitterly, intensely, unsparingly lamented? For man to have so lamented it, were prodigious; for a woman, it were an effort beyond her sex. Surely, then, they

f Eph. ii. 21. *g* Eph. iv. 13. *h* Rev. xx. 6.

who themselves are sinners, would look on such a scene with sympathy.

No, Brethren, the inference is wrong; the treatment which our penitent experienced from the Pharisee, corrects me. "This man, if he were a prophet," said that cold-blooded, haughty judge, "would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him, for she is a sinner." There spoke out, my Brethren, the spirit of the world. Such is the world's mercy, not for them who have offended Heaven, but who have displeased itself. The world condemns more sternly than the Judge of heaven and earth, cavil as it will at the sentences of the final day. The world is inexorable, even on this side of the grave.

Not so the world's Redeemer. His heart had pity, sympathy and mercy for one, whose bare touch would have been accounted contamination by those, who had, perhaps, no fewer, no lighter sins, in the eye of God, to answer for. The immaculate, the sinless, is not inapproachable by those, whom the world would frown into exile and despair.

Learn from this, ye weary and heavy laden, that in the world ye can have no help. It will laugh at your calamity; it will mock when your fear cometh. It will say to your anguish and remorse, as the priests did to Judas, and drove him mad—"What is that to us; see thou to that."

O, give up forever, then, expectation from any earthly resources. Turn you to the strong hold, ye

prisoners of hope.[i] Seek ye the Lord, while he may be found; call ye upon him, while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord; and *he* will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for *he* will abundantly pardon.[j] He, and he only, can or will say, thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace!

i Zech. ix. 12. *j* Isaiah, lv. 6, 7.

SERMON IX.

THE STANDARD OF APPEAL ON DOUBTFUL POINTS, WHERE THE BIBLE FAILS TO PRODUCE UNITY.

"*For the Jews had agreed already, that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the Synagogue.*"—John, ix. 22.

"*Behold, I thought, he will surely come out to me.*"—2 Kings, v. 11.

"*I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.*"—Acts, xxvi. 9.

"*Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?*"—Acts, ix. 6.

THIS putting together of passages from different parts of the Bible, in order to form *one* text, may seem singular and unauthorized; but ought hardly to do so, in view of the fact, that the Author and subject of the Bible are one also. And still less should it seem improper, in the present case, since all four of the passages selected, bear directly upon my subject, which is to show how differently we judge of divine requirements, when influenced by our own spirits, and when influenced by the spirit of God. And I cannot but think such a subject eminently deserving our soberest meditations at the present day. For never, Brethren,

as it appears to me, has there been a time since man was made, when he was more disposed to put his own "I thought" before any testimony to the contrary, presented by earth or heaven, or by both together. This is, indeed, an age, not of reason, but of individual reasons; in which every man's own mind is his highest source of information and guidance, and when, in all matters of opinion, man's highest delight has grown to be, the doing of that, and that only, which is right in his own eyes.[a] Talk to the world, now, of *authority* in matters of religion, and you are suspected at once of talking Popery; of a disposition to steal from the unwary the blessed right of private judgment, and to entrap them in the toils of a second Inquisition.

And is it, then, that there is no such thing as authority in matters of religion? That there are no laws of reverence and submission, which we are obligated to respect and obey? that nothing is to be taken upon trust, but demonstration must be had for every thing; and that, too, a demonstration which suits exactly our own "I thought?" If this be the ground, which, in our protestation against Romish and inquisitorial tyranny, we are called upon and expected to take, it behoves us well to know it understandingly. That some—that many Protestants, do suppose this to be the

a "And take upon us the mystery of things,
As if we were God's spies."

Lear, v. 3.

Or, as a Divine contemporaneous with Shakspeare expressed it, some people coin what doctrine they will, with the minting-irons of their own brain. It seems, our disease is hereditary—a part, doubtless, of original sin.

ground which all Protestants are bound to take, I am constrained to fear is but too true; for some—for many, appear to think, that Protestantism is, in all respects, the direct opposite of Popery; and that the only way in which we can be true Christians, is to believe and to do, in all particulars, the absolute contrary of what is believed and done by Papists.

Now, if this be right, in reference to authority in matters of religion, because the Church of Rome asserts and maintains, that there is such a thing as such authority, then I have simply to observe, that the deists are, in this article, at least, the most correct of all opponents of Popery; for no writers of modern times avow so stiffly, as they do, the unlimited rights of reason and of private judgment, or have advocated those rights so vehemently. If to disbelieve all authority in matters of religion, to argue against it strenuously, and even to sneer at it as a dogma of Romanism—if this be to become a true and deserving Protestant, then, of all others, do the deists most merit that high and honored name.

Do we shrink from such a conclusion, which I have purposely followed out, to show you where they must end, who account the opposite of Popery the only truth? then what remains, but that we take our stand somewhere between the extreme of Romanism, which enslaves the judgment, and latitudinarianism, heresy and deism, which set it free from every thing but the counsel of its own will? But this is precisely the stand taken by our own Church; of which you could not have a more thorough proof, than the fact that, from

the days of the Reformation, Papists have called us schismatics and heretics, while schismatics and heretics have called us Papists. Of course, we are exactly between the two—as far removed from one extreme as from the other. And, as a general rule, if you wish to know what the true doctrine of your Church, in any given instance, is, you cannot have a better than this: strike the middle ground between Papists, who have abandoned the Catholic faith on one side, and schismatics and heretics who have abandoned it on the other; and *there* you will find the object of your search.[b]

But to come now to our more immediate topic, the subject of authority in matters of religion. What is the stand taken upon this subject by the Church of

b The middle character of the Church of England has been acknowledged by those *outside* of her.

"We never doubted that the Church of England was widely different from the Church of Rome; we own she is freed from innumerable Romish superstitions, and we bless God for it."—*Pierce's Vindicat. of Dissenters*, p. 299.

Pierce then goes on to say, (as we might expect,) that too much of the old leaven is left. But, for all that, here is a clear admission of INNUMERABLE reformations.

Says Mosheim, the Lutheran, "Thus was that form of religion established in Britain, which separated the English, equally from the Church of Rome on the one hand, and from the other churches which had renounced Popery on the other."—*Institutes*, Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Part ii. §17; or vol. iv. p. 378, Maclaine's Translation.

The following is the testimony of the celebrated Isaac Casaubon, (a layman too,) who visited England in the reign of James I.—"Mr. Casaubon, in his epistles, admires and recommends the temper of our church, to his brethren beyond seas, as the σύνδεσμος of purity and antiquity, which was not else to be found, any where."—*Todd's Life of Bp. Walton.* i. 259.

Not dissimilar was the testimony of the great Duke of Sully, when he visited England also.—*Quart. Rev.* x. 94.

Rome, and by those at the farthest remove from her; and how is the stand taken by our own Church, between the two, to be illustrated by the passages of Scripture arranged to form a text?

The Church of Rome teaches, that what the Pope, who is its representative and head, shall *now* declare *ex cathedrâ* to be a matter of faith, it must be believed on peril of the soul's salvation. There is no appeal from such decree, no refuge from its obligation—none whatever. So that, one of the ablest of Romish writers, to put this subject in the strongest light possible, does not hesitate to say, that if the supreme authority of the Church of Rome were to decree virtues to be vices, and vices to be virtues, there is no help for us—we must submit implicitly.[c]

Those who, to avoid this manifest and inexorable despotism, fly to the opposite extreme, tell us that in interpreting Scripture, every man is a law unto himself; that what every man believes to be Scripture, *is* Scripture to his mind; and that, consequently, all we can do is, to put the Bible in his hands, and exhort him to read it for himself, responsible to God alone for the sense which he attaches to it.[d]

c Nam fides catholica docet omnem virtutem esse bonam, omnem vitium esse malum: si autem Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.—*Bellarmine de Rom. Pont.*—Op. Lut. Par. tom. i. col. 804. To say, as is sometimes said, that Bellarmine qualified this afterwards, by applying it to *doubtful* cases only, does not mend the matter. Who is to say what the doubtful cases are? Why, of course, the Pope; so that he has the whole game in his own hands still.—*Wordsworth's Letters to Gondon*, vol. ii. p. 12, etc.

d The declaration of Rome about the obligations of a *present faith* alone of the Church, is precisely the ground which John Robinson took, in his

Is there, then, no medium between unlimited spiritual tyranny and the unlimited rovings of private judgment? Our Church, Brethren, and her soundest divines, have always taught that there is. We find in the Prayer Book, "ancient authors" as well as Holy Scripture appealed to, for the settlement of doubtful and disputed points. In the Articles we are referred to "the custom of the primitive Church," as a means of throwing light on matters which Scripture, according to modern disputants, determines very different ways. And in the Homilies, we are again and again reminded, that the primitive Church was "most uncorrupt and

farewell address to the Plymouth Pilgrims at Leyden; and which was taken also by the Independents, when they broke off from the Westminster Assembly, in 1643. So that here the Romish theory and the private judgment theory, when acted out, come to the same conclusion—i. e., present faith, and that only. Robinson, in his "Parting Advice" to his followers, thus blames both Lutherans and Calvinists, for abiding by a present creed, as obligatory for the future. "As, for example, the Lutherans, they could not be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; for whatever part of God's will he had further imparted and revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it. And so also, saith he, you see the Calvinists stick where he left them; a misery much to be lamented." Robinson's own creed was that of the Development men of our day, (whether in, or out, of the Church of Rome;) for "he was very confident, the Lord had more truth and light to break forth out of His Holy Word." *Robinson's Work*s, vol. i. p. xliv. edit. 1851.

True to this Platform, the Independents, when they issued their "Apologeticall Narration," in 1643, carefully avowed their *present* notions, as the only truth to them. "A second principle we carried along with us, in all our resolutions, was, not to make our present judgment and practice, a binding law unto ourselves for the future."—*Edwards's Antapologia; or Reply to the Narration.* Lond. 1644. p. 85. Edwards was an old-fashioned Presbyterian; the same who wrote the celebrated Gangraena.

Thus we see, that Popery and Independency meet in the same conclusion—*a present church;* in other words, both embrace the fashionable theory of Development. Pope Pius IX., in adopting the Immaculate Conception into his creed, did right, according to the principles of the "Apologeticall Narration," which is the Magna Charta of Independency.

pure;" that in the times of that Church, "Christian religion was most pure, and, indeed, golden;"[e] and that, therefore, to follow the example of the primitive Church, is the surest possible way to bring *our* religion to the pattern of actually apostolic times.

And, unquestionably, on all points of prominence and general interest, this is the surest way of proceeding, and would sooner bring mankind to a substantial unity of faith and practice, than any other which human ingenuity has devised. I doubt, indeed, whether the testimony of pure Christian antiquity covers as much ground as some have fondly imagined. That antiquity will not tell us how every disputed text of the Bible is to be translated.[f] But it will tell us, very plainly and very explicitly, *facts* in respect to cardinal doctrines and rites; which is all that we want to establish substantial unity. Diversities, in respect to lesser subjects, prevailed even in apostolic times; and will prevail, while human nature is as imperfect as it must ever be in a fallen state. Take, however, any prominent point in doctrine, discipline or worship—any such point as can be settled by the testimony of widely accepted facts—and pure Christian antiquity is prompt and decisive in its answer.

e See particularly the Homily against Peril of Idolatry.

f This exception is no more than Waterland allows, in his invaluable Chapter on the "Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity." He says, "the stress is not laid upon any critical acumen of the Fathers in interpreting every particular text; but upon their faithfulness in relating what was the *doctrine of the church*, as to the *prime* things, in their times, or before; and upon their interpretation of some remarkable and leading texts, (such as John, i. 1.,) upon which, chiefly, the fundamental doctrines were conceived to rest."—*Waterland's Works*, 2d edit. iii. 650.

Would you know, for example, whether the primitive Church believed in the doctrine of the Trinity? The Nicene Creed, which was the testimony[g] of all Christendom, as to what had ever been believed respecting the Godhead, is an answer which heretics can not quibble away, as they do texts of Scripture. The very ringleader of ancient Unitarians tried, in every possible manner, to evade that Creed's expressions, and was forced to abandon the enterprise as desperate.[h] Would you know whether the primitive Church had such an officer as we now call bishop? Lists of such officers, traced up to the apostles' days, can be produced with ease.[i] Would you know whether primitive Christians worshipped with a form? Their actual liturgies can be laid before you. You have a perennial specimen in that most comprehensive and appropriate collect, at the close of morning and evening prayer, called "A Prayer of St. Chrysostom." Would you know whether they had an order of men called clergy, and employed sacraments as outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace? You can

g The *testimony*, not the *decree*. Hence its amazing value, as an attestation of the Catholic faith "through the ages all along."

h This was in A. D. 325. So in A. D. 383, the Macedonians, who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, gave way before "the common suffrage of the ancients."—*Waterland's Works*, iii. 659.

i It seems unaccountably strange, that it should be the impression of many, that the Primitive Church was not careful to maintain a record of Episcopal successions. Why, Eusebius tells us he devoted *seven* books of his Ecclesiastical History to that very subject! See the preface to his *eighth* Book, the opening of his *first* Book, the close of the *seventh*, and the close of chapter fourth, Book third. Surely, an apostolic succession was not lightly esteemed in primitive times, how much soever of a novelty and monstrosity some pronounce it now.

not stir one step, in the history of the primitive Church, without encountering such things.

Thus easily could great principles, now daily and sharply disputed by different Christian sects, each and all appealing with the same confidence to the Bible, and appealing, as fact shows, entirely in vain (since they differ, still, as much as ever)—thus easily, I say, could great principles be settled, which would produce substantial unity among all who profess and call themselves Christians.

But even the Papist, fond, as many suppose him, of relying for the maintenance of his cause upon the old fathers, rejects their testimony when it pleases him not. They talk of bishops, but not of a Pope; and, therefore, in his view, the present Church is both truer and wiser. The advocate of ministerial parity rejects them, because, silent if they be respecting a Pope, they speak too familiarly and frequently of bishops, to be accounted any thing but Episcopalians. The Socinian rejects them for their Nicene Creed; the Anabaptist for their infant baptisms; the Quaker for their outward sacraments and standing ministry; and Protestants, of many names and classes, because of their habitual employment of forms of prayer.

And yet, *all* of them, from the Papist down to the Socinian, appeal to this same antiquity, to settle one of the most fundamental of all possible positions, the Canon of Christian Scripture itself. The New Testament was not *all* written, for more than sixty years after the Ascension of Christ. There was a multitude of writings, scattered over Christendom, claiming to

be Epistles and Gospels; for St. Paul warns the Thessalonians against forged epistles, written to inculcate the opinion that the end of the world was nigh;[j] and St. Luke, in the preface to his Gospel, alludes to "many" who had taken in hand the subject of our Saviour's life, and executed their task like bunglers; because they had not written "in order," nor had "perfect understanding of all things from the very first."

But, amid this mass of Epistles and Gospels, (many of which were famous enough to be preserved and to come down to our own times,) who should determine what was truly inspired and apostolic, and therefore genuine Scripture? Who should settle the delicate and perplexing question, whether the Epistle of Barnabas, an actual apostle, should be thrown out of the Sacred Canon, while productions of Mark and Luke, neither of them of apostolic rank, should be inserted into it? The Primitive Church decided these first and foremost of theological questions, and has given us our present New Testament.[k]

Now, knowing this, our own Church has, not unwisely or strangely, as some think, but most judiciously determined, that the Primitive Church which settled the great fundamental question, 'What is the New Testament?' is equally competent to testify to the next

j 2 Thess. ii. 1, 2.

k In respect to this question, says the Presbyterian, Dr. Spring, "Our appeal is to the earliest ecclesiastical historians; and we find a perfect agreement among them."—*Rule of Faith*, 1844, p. 28.—They agree as perfectly about Episcopacy. Will the learned doctor listen to them on that point?

great fundamental question, 'What was the New Testament, in apostolic times, believed to teach?' Therefore, as in her Homily, on the peril of idolatry, she commends the Primitive Church as a standard, "which is specially to be followed as most incorrupt and pure;" and is willing to take its testimony at large, on all chief points of doctrine, discipline and worship. And she is the only Christian communion which treats Christian antiquity consistently. For, while she is ready to go to such antiquity for *any* thing, which the Bible (as sects and disputes show) cannot settle clearly, all others, from the Romanist down to the Socinian, reject the Fathers for one reason or for another; and yet, without those Fathers, they cannot determine which is the true Scripture and which is false!

Such, Brethren, is our Church's view of the necessity of something besides private judgment, or a stern anathema, to settle disputed questions in religion, and such is the standard to which she cheerfully and confidently appeals. And this mode of reference was any thing but new and strange, in those trying times, when our ecclesiastical forefathers, attacked on all sides, had to defend themselves against their thronging foes, "by the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left." Then, it was well known to the laity, as well as to the clergy, as an extract from even a poem will show. Says Dryden, in his "Religio Laici," or Layman's Faith,

> In doubtful questions, 'tis the safest way
> To learn what unsuspected ancients say;

> For 'tis not likely we should higher soar
> In search of heaven, than all the Church before;
> Nor can we be deceived, unless we see
> The Scripture and the Fathers disagree.

Not, however, "as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say"—not that our Church puts the testimony of Christian antiquity *above* Scripture, or on *a par* with Scripture. That, Romanism or Rationalism alike may do; but *we* say, 'God forbid it.' With us, Christian antiquity is "a witness, not at all competing with Scripture—never to be balanced against it; but competing with our less able, and less pure, apprehension of Scripture."[l] But, unless we submit to the Pope, and take what he says as infallible—or erect every man's judgment into a pope, and make it infallible for *him*—there must be some umpire in disputed cases. Well, if so, what shall that umpire be? it is useless to say that the Bible shall be such an umpire, *for the meaning of the Bible is the very matter in dispute?* and with the Bible only for an arbiter, sects would and could come no nearer unity than they do now. If I may again quote Dryden, (of whom it was said, that he reasoned better and more closely in poetry than in prose,)

> We hold, and say we prove from Scripture plain,
> That Christ is God; the bold Socinian
> From the same Scripture urges he's but man.
> Now what appeal can end th' important suit?
> Both parts talk loudly, but the rule is mute.

l J. E. Tyler's Primitive Worship, p. 4.

We must give up these *opinions* about the Bible, and come to *facts of history*, for its just interpretation. We must ask, How did those believe, and those act, who were nearest the Apostles' days; who received at their hands the Church, the ministry, and the Catholic faith, and were most likely to *have*, and to exemplify, the Bible's true construction? The facts which rise up to answer such a question, you have seen (a specimen at least of them); and you have further seen how easily and quickly they can determine questions now most vehemently disputed. Be it, that such an appeal would fail in some cases; since there ever were, and ever will be, those who, "though vanquished can argue still." It would not fail in multitudes; and it would save us from many of those lawless speculations of ignorance, self-conceit and heresy, which are every whit as arbitrary and magisterial as decrees from the Roman Vatican. Be it, that such an appeal is not perfection or inspiration. Where I ask, with all assurance, since the Bible will not harmonize us—where can common sense, or "science," *not* "falsely so-called," or enlightened piety, point out to us a better? It is but the principle of settling doubtful constructions, by the most authoritative and least suspicious precedents. But that is a principle of confessed and universal obligation, in all courts of law and justice;[m] and in such courts, if any where on earth, is pure reason supposed to hold sovereign and undisputed sway.

It is time, however, some of you will doubtless

[m] "*Contemporanea expositio est optima et fortissima in lege*, is a very maxim among jurists."—*Broom's Legal Maxims*, 2d ed. p. 532.

think, to draw a little nearer to my compound text, and show how it illustrates the topic on which I have been insisting—the necessity of some standard of appeal in disputed matters of religion, and the manner in which our own Church has recognized such necessity, and provided for its exigencies.

That text, in its various portions, bears chiefly upon the mischiefs attending an *arbitrary* method of settling disputed or doubtful points (whether by the decrees of the Church,[n] or the decrees of our own minds); and commends to us, in the example of one who was beginning the life of a disciple, the profound and practical submissiveness of humble and earnest piety.

The passage depicting the conduct of the Jews, when one of their number acknowledged Jesus for the Messiah, shows how mischievous ecclesiastical decrees may become, when founded upon nothing but present and dominant impressions. In the decree of the Synagogue, which was a decree of excommunication, you have an exact counterpart of the policy and conduct of the Church of Rome. That policy is to admit no standard of appeal, but the Church of Rome's decrees, and to denounce, as heretics, all who dissent from such a violent and selfish determination; or dare even *to doubt* its righteousness.[o] Sometimes all which

n I mean *decrees* in the proper sense. Not creeds; for I beg again to say, the point is so constantly misunderstood, the old creeds are not decrees, they are *testimony*.

o "Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostræ, damnationis, reprobationis, definitionis, inhibitionis, decreti, ordinationis, statuti, et mandati infringere, vel ei ausu, temerario contraire."—*Conc. Lateran. V. sub Leon. X. Sess.* viii.

This is strong enough, probably, as a threat against all *acts* contrary

can thus be done is simply to denounce; but where the Inquisition can prevail, the process can be pursued to shapes of torture and death, which fiends might gloat upon.

But the direful arm of the Inquisition was wielded, long before the name arose, and the thing was founded in form in modern Spain. The decree, the excommunication, and the anathema, of the Synagogue of Jerusalem, were as truly inquisitorial as any thing ever sanctioned by the bulls of the Papal See, or the fiats of papal thrones. They are the natural mischiefs attending the erection of a church into a tribunal, presuming to speak the voice of God, with the majesty and with the force of law. Persecution will ever be the issue. The blood of the oppressed will, sooner or later, cry unto him who has most solemnly and most sovereignly declared that vengeance is his sole prerogative—that he, and he only, may repay.[p]

We may think, however, that it is perfectly safe to take from the Church the power to decree, and to enforce decrees by temporal punishments, and refer the whole subject to private judgment. But, as another part of my text teaches, we do no better. Endow private judgment with arbitrary power—let it make

to Rome. Now for an authority to extinguish the bare *doubter* of Rome's infallibility. It is from Azorius, a celebrated Spanish Jesuit of the 16th century, who wrote folios upon morals. "Si quem in foro exteriori legitimè allegata et probata probaverint in rebus Fidei, scienter et voluntariè dubitasse, arbitror eum, ut verè et propriè, hæreticum puniendum." —*Tom. I. Moral. Lib.* viii. ch. 9. Quoted in Hacket's Abp. Williams, pt i. p. 103, No. 2; as p. 103 is repeated twice.

[p] We may *reject* a man for heresy; but we cannot go on and heap retribution on him, after a Jewish or Romish fashion.—Titus, iii. 10.

its own decisions the rule of right—and private judgment is just as persecuting as the Pope, with his crook and sword. Look at Saul of Tarsus, determining by his private judgment whether all Christianity were not treason, or an old wives' fable. "I verily thought with myself, I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." And what was the direct consequence of this arbitrary thinking with himself? To seek authority for persecuting; which, once obtained, many of the saints did he shut up in prison; many did he punish in every synagogue; many did he compel to blaspheme; many did he drive before the goads of cruelty, to strange and distant cities; while those who perished were, by his voice, sentenced to the horrors of a malefactor's death.

So, then, private judgment can persecute as well as Popery, and with as unrelenting vehemence; as instances in modern times, but hardly to be named with prudence, might abundantly demonstrate.[q] And if

[q] I alluded to such a denunciatory exercise of private judgment, as was once attempted by a British House of Commons; when it erected itself into a tribunal to establish Calvinism.

"We, The Commons in Parliament assembled, do claim, and protest, and avow for truth, the sense of the Articles of Religion, which were established by Parliament, in the 13th year of our late Queen Elizabeth, which, by the public act of the Church of England, and by the general and current exposition of the writers of our Church, have been delivered unto us. And we reject the sense of the Jesuits, and Arminians, and ALL OTHERS, wherein they differ from us."—*Rushworth's Collections*, i. 649, 50.

So they rejected all Christendom, and the world beside, if they presumed to differ from themselves. They set themselves up for the only "standing order;" as the old phrase was, in the colonial days of New England. I leave it to my readers to say, whether they had after them "a regular succession."

private judgment do not, from the nature of civil institutions, or the tendencies of an age, (things which are clogs on Popery, too,) have as much swing as it could desire for a bloody hand, it will none the less indulge a furious temper. Paul said that he persecuted some from home; probably because he could not persecute them unto death; and against these, he says, he was "exceeding mad." And where, Brethren, painful as the reference is—where will you find more of this excuseless wrath, than among sects, whose fundamental rule is, that each man's decision is infallible for his own self, and that to talk of any standard of appeal in doubtful matters, but the light within, is to talk like the servile adherents of the popedom?

From all which, it is clear that, let the Church decree, or let the individual mind decree, the issue is substantially the same; and the best cure we know of for this serious and ominous predicament, we believe to be, an appeal to a mass of facts which are alike removed from the present Church and from present minds—facts far away in the past, where prejudice and misconstruction cannot so easily reach and mould them. But, alas! when we lisp of deference to the old councils, creeds, and fathers, we are sneered or scoffed at, as depreciating the Bible upon the one hand, and offering fellowship to Rome upon the other.

Thus, we see how to reject such a standard of appeal for authority to settle doubtful cases, as our Church commends to us, results in the indulgence of a persecuting temper. And this illustrates one class

of the mischiefs attending such rejection. There is another class, also, upon which portions of our text bear; to this would I now direct you.

Suppose the restored blind man to have been intimidated by the anathema and excommunication of the Synagogue, and to have disavowed his faith in the Restorer of his body, and the Saviour of his soul. The unity of the Synagogue would not have been broken. But what sort of unity would have prevailed there? a unity of appearance solely: the same which existed in the person of Galileo, when he was denounced as a heretic for affirming the revolution of the earth around the sun.[r] Galileo, through fear of

[r] I add a few words respecting Galileo, though I have alluded to him before; for many are not aware that he is no longer a heretic in the view of Rome. Very few, probably, of the Christian public in this country, are aware how he ceased from being a heretic. The story is told by the Rev. Joseph Mendham in his work on the Index of Gregory XVI., and it admirably illustrates Rome's way of doing business. She puts everybody else in the wrong; yet when confessedly in the wrong herself, never acknowledges an error, but gets out of a false position by stealth. Here, however, is Mr. Mendham to speak for himself. "In the Roman Index of 1704, we read the general condemnation:—*Libri omnes docentes mobilitatem, Terræ et immobilitatem Solis.* Not a vestige of any of these decisive proscriptions is *now* to be found in any Roman Index. The *name* of the persecuted and condemned reviver of a doctrine now universally received, with that of his *Dialogo*, kept their place the last, and were only silently and furtively withdrawn, in the year 1835. In all the preceding Indexes, the condemnation, not of the *man* only, but of the DOCTRINE, stands an imperishable monument of the ignorance, bigotry, and intolerance of the Roman Church."—p. 18. After telling the story of Galileo, Mr. Mendham goes on to show that the ancient heresy of Copernicus and of Foscarini has, by the same Romish alchemy, been transmuted into present orthodoxy. The question is often asked whether Copernicanism is still heresy at Rome; and whether she still presumes to dictate about *philosophy*, as well as theology, to the world at large. To such a question the above is a curious and instructive answer. Rome is fallible, at last, by her own concession; yet the acknowledg-

imprisonment and death, admitted his constructive error; and then observed in an undertone to a by-stander, that notwithstanding all he had said or done, the earth still pursued her legitimate course in the solar system. Force cannot produce genuine unity, and it never will; and under the so much boasted unity of the Church of Rome, he, who sees the heart, may perceive far more sad and numerous diversities, than disfigure the whole Protestant world. Force may make cowards and hypocrites: it can never make true believers. And he who succumbs to all the dogmas of Rome, because of her threats or thunders, would lose heaven twice over, though it were as true, as Rome dictatorially assures us it is, that upon the belief of her dogmas depends our everlasting salvation.

And now, on the other hand, suppose the blind man to have indulged the querulous disposition of Naaman, who, when told to wash in Jordan for the cure of his leprosy, drew himself up in the full grandeur of self-sufficiency, and resolved to follow the dictates of his private judgment, rather than the mandate of the prophet. "Behold," said the haughty captain-general of Syria, "I thought he will surely come out to me." But he did not; and that self-willed "I thought" had nearly left His Mightiness a leper still. If the blind man had listened to the promptings of the same deceiver, he might have gone down to his gloomy grave,

ment is made with not a particle of manliness, but after the manner of a sneak!

and never been greeted by "holy light, offspring of heaven, first born."

And this sort of private judgment it is, which inflicts upon us all the wildness and extravagance of the almost countless sects, which presume to appropriate the name of Christian. Long since did Lord Bolingbroke say, that one "cause of the multiplication of extravagant opinions and sects in Christianity, has been the arbitrary practice, of giving different senses to the same passages of the Bible."[s] And yet, as an infidel, he cared not which way his remark might cut; and was as indifferent to its bearing upon one sect as upon another. And do we not see for ourselves, that he has not missed the mark, in his statement, be the motive which brought it out whatsoever it might? Can we fail to perceive, that sects are inevitable, so long as the Bible is the sole standard of appeal, and the same passage is interpreted twenty different ways; while private judgment is the only guide, and its decisions are infallible for every mind? Is not one man's "I thought," as good as any other man's? and if so, is not one man's "I thought" about the Bible, as good as that of any of his fellows; and again, if so, is not the wildest sectarian under heaven in the right?

But what then, the captious will exclaim, must we sell the birthright of our soul's freedom, and go and bow down to the image of unity, which ecclesiastical pride and usurpation has set up in the vatican at Rome? We ask no such unqualified surrender of your reason, and power of judging aright, and for

s Wks. iii. 464. Philad. 1841.

yourselves. There is a medium, (oh, that it were not such an invisible and inconceivable paradox to thousands!)—there is a medium, and a most blessed one, between the extravagances of Rome, upon the one hand, and the extravagances of schism and heresy upon the other. We ask you not to surrender your reason, to be bound with links of iron; and we beg you not to let it run rampant, like the untamed wild ass, which will not be held by bit or bridle. Exercise it no longer upon conjectures, but upon facts; no longer upon opinions, but upon history. Go to the Church, as she was in the days of her virgin purity, before she was wedded to the state, and began to do, as the married do, the will of an imperious husband. There is a period of three centuries for you to inquire into; and what the Church then was, baptized in the blood of martyrdom, and refined by the fires of persecution, you may safely, most safely, be. Cast in your lot with her, as she then was; for then, most assuredly, her Lord was with her; then she was the brightness of everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of his goodness.[t] The ignorant will try to frighten you, by telling you that this will lead you into the mazes of Popery, and that you will lose your independence, if not your soul. But it is a grand mistake to suppose that Popery existed during the first three centuries, when the Church stood alone, untrammelled, and uncorrupted; when, as one of her oldest historians informs us, there was an inseparable communion between the Western and Eastern Churches;

t Wisdom, vii. 26.

i. e., throughout Christendom.[u] Popery was the growth of the middle ages; of periods when this communion began to be broken or sundered. It attained its fullest development in periods when this communion was most effectually interrupted. It grew fastest under the shadow of monarchical patronage;[v] and is one part of the tribute, which the Church has had to pay, for the misnamed privilege of allowing the state to call her after its own name, and receive her *nominally* under its protection, but *really* under its domination. If the Church were set free, to-morrow, from all civil control and interference, the doom of Popery would speedily be written. "The holy text of pike and gun," now furnishes its strongest arguments; and "infallible artillery" is its surest peace-maker.

Take, then, my Brethren, such a standard to settle disputes about the Bible's meaning, as that commended to you in the Prayer-Book, Articles, and Homilies, the Primitive Church "most incorrupt and pure;" and let that be your rock, while the surges of sectarian controversy are beating about you, and against you. And, with all his ease, and all his comfort, will you do this, if the temper which prevailed in Paul's bosom, when he had ceased to listen to the dictates of private judgment, and sought wiser counsel, prevails in yours. "Lord," said the new convert, when he gave up thinking within himself as a guide, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" True piety is not a boisterous and

u Socrates, book ii. ch. 18.
v Homilies, edit. 1817, London, p. 192.

self-willed assertion of our own rights, the certainty of our own judgments, and a reckless discardance of all authority in spiritual matters. Ecclesiastical despotism, and Pharisaism, and heresy, and Deism, can stand by themselves, and be satisfied with their own selves, perpetually. But genuine piety is humble, diffident, clinging, relying, reverential, anxious not for distinction or self-gratification, but for obedience. Where, it says, are the old paths, in which they whom the world knew not, nay, whom it hated, the paths in which they walked, where I may find refuge for my longing soul? Carry me back to the days of the earliest followers of Christ, let me see how *they* thought, and felt, and acted, and I may obtain light and peace. I am weary with the din of sects; this perpetual arrogance of infallibility—Iam of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ. The Bible, in modern hands, means every thing or nothing. Let me have its meaning, as the Primitive Church possessed it, and I will content myself and be at rest.[w]

Thus may God help you to discover your Master's will, and to do it perpetually for your everlasting joy. And setting out with such a scheme; discarding Popery on the one hand, and sectarianism on the other, as the manufactures of men; relying on the Church, as she was in her earliest and best days, for your model and guide, my faith is all-confiding, that if, under God, the truth as it is in Jesus without mixture

w "To understand the Holy Scriptures aright," says the eminently devout Bishop Wilson, "is to understand them as the Primitive Church did."—*Wilson's Works*, ii. 227.

is any where to be found, it will greet your eyes—nay, bless and gladden them, to your latest days. And, then, when the light of the Church below shall cease to shine on you, the light of the Church above shall be exchanged for it. No more shall your sun go down, or your moon withdraw itself; for the Lord shall be your everlasting light, and the days of your mourning shall be ended.

NOTE.—The doctrine of this Sermon has sometimes been considered incompatible with the free dissemination of the Scriptures. The intelligent will at once perceive, that it is consistent with the *freest* dissemination of the Scriptures. All it opposes is a lawless interpretation of the Bible; while it suggests a guide to its ancient and true sense.

8 Oct 1959.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 137 860 0